



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

सी.जी.-डी.एल.-सा.-01052024-253998
CG-DL-W-01052024-253998

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 16]

नई दिल्ली, अप्रैल 21—अप्रैल 27, 2024, शनिवार/ वैशाख 1—वैशाख 7, 1946

No. 16]

NEW DELHI, APRIL 21—APRIL 27, 2024, SATURDAY/VAISAKHA 1—VAISAKHA 7, 1946

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय

(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 727.—केन्द्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा, भारत सरकार के महालेखा नियंत्रक कार्यालय के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों, जिनके 80% (अस्सी प्रतिशत) कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान अर्जित कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है, नामतः

- सार्वजनिक वित्तीय प्रबंधन प्रणाली, राज्य निदेशालय, तीसरा तल, पंडित दीनदयाल उपाध्याय भवन, पुंडलीक देवस्थान के निकट, पुंडलीक नगर, योजना, सांख्यिकी और मूल्यांकन निदेशालय, आल्टो पोरवोरिम, गोवा-403521
- सार्वजनिक वित्तीय प्रबंधन प्रणाली, राज्य निदेशालय, तीसरा तल, जीवन संपिगे भवन, संपिगे मार्ग, मल्लेश्वरम, बेंगलुरु, कर्नाटक-560003

3. सार्वजनिक वित्तीय प्रबंधन प्रणाली, राज्य निदेशालय, कमरा सं. 15, सीपीएओ कॉम्प्लेक्स, पोर्ट ब्लेयर, अंडमान एवं निकोबार द्वीप समूह-744101
4. सार्वजनिक वित्तीय प्रबंधन प्रणाली, राज्य निदेशालय, दूसरा तल, स्पार्क बिल्डिंग, उप्पलम रोड, बीएसएनएल भवन के सामने, तिरुवनंतपुरम, केरल
5. सार्वजनिक वित्तीय प्रबंधन प्रणाली, राज्य निदेशालय, पहला तल, ललित भवन, बेली रोड, पटना, बिहार-800001

[फा. सं. ई-11016/1/2021-हिन्दी]

परमा सेन, अपर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 18th April, 2024

S.O. 727.—In pursuance of sub-rule(4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for official purposes of the union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following office of the Controller General of Accounts, New Delhi, Government of India, in which 80% (eighty percent) of the staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi, namely:-

1. Public Finance Management System, State Directorate, Goa, 3rd floor, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Bhawan, Near Pundalik Devasthan, Pundalik Nagar, O/o Directorate of Planning, Statistics and Evaluation, Alto Porvorim, Goa-403521
2. Public Finance Management System, State Directorate, Karnataka, 3rd Floor, Jeevan Sampige Building, Sampige Road, Malleshwaram, Bengaluru-560003
3. Public Finance Management System, State Directorate, Room No. 15, CPAO Complex, Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar Island-744101
4. Public Finance Management System, State Directorate, Kerala, 2nd Floor, Spark Building, Uppalam road, Opp. BSNL Bhawan, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala
5. Public Finance Management System, State Directorate, Bihar, 1st Floor, Lalit Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800001

[F. No. E.-11016/1/2021-Hindi]

PARAMA SEN, Addl. Secy.

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 दिसम्बर, 2024

का.आ. 728.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, (i) श्री दीपक सबरवाल (ii) श्री रवि कुमार गुप्ता (iii) श्री आकाशदीप सिंह (iv) श्री प्रतीक गुप्ता और (v) श्री गगनदीप वासू को चंडीगढ़ में माननीय पंजाब और हरियाणा उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष अपील, पुनरीक्षण और दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा अन्वेषित मामलों से उद्भूत अन्य मामलों में अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या और आदेशों तक इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक/रिटेनर काउंसिल के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/05/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS**(Department of Personnel and Training)**

New Delhi, the 14th December, 2023

S.O. 728.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints (i) Sh. Deepak Sabherwal, (ii) Sh. Ravi Kamal Gupta, (iii) Sh. Akashdeep Singh, (iv) Sh. Prateek Gupta and (v) Gagandeep Singh Wasu as Special Public Prosecutor/Retainer Counsels for conducting prosecution, appeals, revisions and other matters arising out of the cases investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, for a period of three years from the date of their assumption of charge or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/05/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 दिसम्बर, 2023

का.आ. 729.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री वैक्होम दाराकेश्वर सिंह और श्री सालाम समरजीत सिंह, अधिवक्ताओं को, मणीपुर उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए, उनकी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगला आदेश होने तक, जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक (रीटेनर कौंसिल) नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/18/2021-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th December, 2023

S.O. 729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Waikhom Darakeshwar Singh and Shri Salam Samarjeet Singh, Advocates, as Special Public Prosecutors (Retainer Counsels) to represent the Central Bureau of Investigation before the High Court of Manipur for a period of three years from the date of their appointment or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/18/2021-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 19 दिसम्बर, 2023

का.आ. 730.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिवक्ताओं को, सारणी के स्तंभ (3) में प्रत्येक के समक्ष यथा उल्लिखित दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों के, उक्त सारणी स्तंभ (4) में उल्लिखित, त्रिपुरा राज्य के विचारण न्यायालयों के समक्ष संस्थित किए गए मामलों में अभियोजन के संचालन के लिए उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा मामलों का निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

क्र. सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम (श्री/श्रीमती)	आर.सी. सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	प्रवीर साहा	(i) आरसी5ए2012एसएचजी	जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश, पश्चिमी त्रिपुरा, अगरतला
		(ii) आरसी4ए2014एसएचजी	जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश, पश्चिमी त्रिपुरा, अगरतला

		(iii) आरसी2ए2019एसएचजी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, न्यायालय सं. 2, पश्चिमी त्रिपुरा, अगरतला
		(iv) आरसी3ए2014एसएचजी	जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश, उत्तरी त्रिपुरा, धर्मानगर
		(v) आरसी10(ई)2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश (जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश), पश्चिमी त्रिपुरा, अगरतला
2.	रिचर्ड सिन्हा	(i) आरसी9ए2008एसएचजी	न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, अगरतला
		(ii) आरसी9(ई)2013	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, उदयपुर, गोमाटी, जिला उदयपुर, त्रिपुरा
		(iii) आरसी11(ई)2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश, पश्चिमी त्रिपुरा, अगरतला
3.	प्रसन्नजीत साहा	(i) आरसी12(ई)2013केओएल	विशेष न्यायाधीश, (जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश), ऊमाकोटी

[फा. सं. 225/43/2022-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th December, 2023

S.O. 730.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the Advocates specified in column (2) of the Table below as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of the cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) mentioned against each in column (3) of the table, before trial courts mentioned in column (4) of the said Table, in the State of Tripura, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier: -

Sl. No.	Name of Advocate (Sh./Smt.)	RC No.	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Prabir Saha	(i) RC5A2012SHG	District & Sessions Judge, West Tripura, Agartala.
		(ii) RC4A2014SHG	District & Sessions Judge, West Tripura, Agartala.
		(iii) RC2A2019SHG	Special Judge, Court No. 2, West Tripura, Agartala.
		(iv) RC3A2014SHG	District & Sessions Judge, North Tripura, Dharamanagar.
		(v) RC10(E)/2013	Special Judge (District & Sessions Judge), West Tripura, Agartala.
2.	Richard Sinha	(i) RC9A2008SHG	Judicial Magistrate, Agartala
		(ii) RC9(E)/2013	Chief Judicial Magistrate, Udaipur, Gomati District, Udaipur, Tripura
		(iii) RC11(E)/2013	Special Judge, West Tripura, Agartala
3.	Prasenjit Saha	(i) RC12(E)/2013KOL	Special Judge, District & Sessions Judge, Unakoti.

[F. No. 225/43/2022-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर, 2023

का.आ. 731.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिवक्ताओं को उक्त सारणी में प्रत्येक के समक्ष यथा उल्लिखित दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित चौबीस मामलों (पश्चिमी बंगाल राज्य के मतदान पश्चात् हिंसा के मामले) और तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपीलीय या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में इन मामलों से उद्भूत अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों के अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा मामलों का निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

क्र. सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम (श्री/श्रीमती)	आर0सी0सं0	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	कौशिक भट्टा	(i) आरसी0562021एस0010	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, तूफानगंज, जिला-कूच बिहार
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0014	अतिरिक्त जिला और सेशन न्यायालय, दिनहाता, जिला-कूच बिहार
		(iii) आरसी0562022एस0010	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दिनहाता, जिला-कूच बिहार
		(iv) आरसी0562021एस0019	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, मथाभंगा, जिला-कूच बिहार
		(v) आरसी0562021एस0037	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायालय, प्रथम न्यायालय, विशेष एससी/एसटी न्यायालय, जिला-कूचबिहार
2.	अमित्वा मित्रा	(i) आरसी0562021एस000044	अतिरिक्त जिला और सेशन न्यायालय, प्रथम न्यायालय, विशेष एससी/एसटी न्यायालय, बालूरघाट, जिला-दिनांजपुर
3.	सत्येन्द्र नाथ दास	(i) आरसी0562021एस 0018	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश प्रथम, बोलपुर, जिला-बीरभूम
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0025	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश, बोलपुर, जिला-बीरभूम
		(iii) आरसी0562021एस0020	एसीजेएम रामपुर हाट, जिला-बीरभूम
4.	सोमनाथ मुखर्जी	(i) आरसी0562021एस 0024	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश द्वितीय, फास्ट ट्रेक न्यायालय, रामपुर हाट, जिला-बीरभूम
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0023	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश तृतीय न्यायालय, सूरी, जिला-बीरभूम
		(iii) आरसी0562021एस0051	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश, सूरी, जिला-बीरभूम
5.	प्रदीप कुमार प्रमानिक	(i) आरसी0562021एस0011	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायाधीश, तृतीय न्यायालय, कृष्णा नगर, जिला-नादिया
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0005	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश, सातवां, फास्ट

			ट्रेक न्यायालय-I, कृष्णा नगर, जिला-नादिया
		(iii) आरसी0562021एस0034	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, कल्याणी, जिला-नादिया
6.	बिस्वाजीत बासु	(i) आरसी0562021एस0003	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायाधीश, फास्ट ट्रेक न्यायालय, राना घाटा, जिला-नादिया
		(ii) आरसी0562022एस0002	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, राना घाट, जिला-नादिया
7.	सुभाजीत सिंहा	(i) आरसी0562021एस0046	अतिरिक्त जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश, फास्ट ट्रेक न्यायालय-III, जिला -पश्चिमी मिदनापुर
8.	प्रोसुन चक्रवर्ती	(i) आरसी0562021एस0041	जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश झारागांव, जिला-झारागांव
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0031	अतिरिक्त जिला न्यायाधीश प्रथम, झारागांव, जिला-झारागांव
9.	मलाय कुमार सिन्हा	(i) आरसी0562021एस0032	अतिरिक्त सेशन न्यायाधीश, फास्ट ट्रेक न्यायालय, हल्दिया, जिला-पूर्वी मिदनापुर
		(ii) आरसी0562021एस0003	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया, जिला-पूर्वी मिदनापुर
		(iii) आरसी0562021एस0033	अतिरिक्त जिला और सेशन न्यायालय, प्रथम न्यायालय, (विशेष एससी/एसटी न्यायालय), तामलुक जिला-पूर्वी मिदनापुर
		(iv) आरसी0562021एस0052	अतिरिक्त मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, कोंताई, जिला-पूर्वी मिदनापुर

[फा. सं. 225/02/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th December, 2023

S.O. 731.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Advocates specified in column (2) of the Table below, as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting the prosecution of twenty four cases (Post Poll Violence cases of the State of West Bengal) instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) as mentioned against each in the said table and any appeal, revision or other matters arising out of the those cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by any law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of cases, whichever is earlier: -

Sl.No. (1)	Name of Advocate (Sh./Smt.) (2)	RC. No. (3)	Name of the Court (4)
1.	Kaushik Bhadra	(i) RC0562021S0010	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tufanganj, District-Cooch Behar
		(ii) RC0562021S0014	Additional District & Sessions Judge, Dinhata, District - Cooch Behar
		(iii) RC0562022S0010	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dinhata, District - Cooch Behar
		(iv) RC0562021S0019	Additional District & Sessions Judge, Mathabhanga, District - Cooch Behar

		(v) RC0562021S0037	Additional Sessions Judge, 1 st Court, Special SC/ST Court, District Cooch Behar.
2.	Amitava Maitra	(i) RC0562021S000044	Additional District & Sessions Judge, 1 st Court, Special SC/ST Court Balurghat, District-South Dinajpur
3.	Satyendra Nath Das	(i) RC0562021S0018	Additional District Judge 1 st , Bolpur, District - Birbhum
		(ii) RC0562021S0025	Additional District Judge, Bolpur, District - Birbhum
		(iii) RC0562021S0020	ACJM Rampurhat, District- Birbhum
4.	Somenath Mukherjee	(i) RC0562021S0024	Additional District Judge 2 nd , Fast Track Court, Rampurhat District - Birbhum
		(ii) RC0562021S0023	Additional Sessions Judge, 3 rd Court, Suri, District - Birbhum
		(iii) RC0562021S0051	Additional Sessions Judge, Suri, District - Birbhum
5.	Pradip Kumar Pramanik	(i) RC0562021S0011	Additional Sessions Judge, 3 rd Court, Krishnanagar, District - Nadia
		(ii) RC0562021S0005	Additional District Judge, 7 th , Fast Track Court-I, Krishnanagar, Distt.- Nadia
		(iii) RC0562021S0034	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kalyani, District -Nadia
6.	Biswajit Basu	(i) RC0562021S0003	Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Ranaghat, District - Nadia
		(ii) RC0562022S0002	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranaghat, District - Nadia
7.	Subhajit Singha	(i) RC0562021S0046	Additional District and Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court-II, District – Pashchimi Medinipur
8.	Prosun Chakraborty	(i) RC0562021S0041	District & Sessions Judge Jhargram, District - Jhargram
		(ii) RC0562021S0031	Additional District Judge 1 st , Jhargram, District Jhargram
9.	Malay Kumar Sinha	(i) RC0562021S0032	Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Haldia, District – Purba Medinipur
		(ii) RC0562022S0003	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia, District – Purba Medinipur
		(iii) RC0562021S0033	Additional District & Sessions Judge, 1 st Court (Special SC/ST Court) Tamluk, District – Purba Medinipur
		(iv) RC0562021S0052	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Contai, District – Purba Medinipur

[F. No. 225/02/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 2023

का.आ. 732.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिवक्तागणों को उक्त सारणी में उनके नाम के समक्ष उल्लिखित किए गए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (सीबीआई) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों और विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपीलीय या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में इन मामलों से उद्भूत अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों के अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए उसके भार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा मामलों के निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

सारणी

क्र. सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम (श्री/श्रीमती)	आर.सी.सं.	न्यायालय मामला सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	अजय चौधरी	आरसी.43/ए/1988(आंशिक रूप से निपटाया गया मामला)	विशेष17/2012(नया) विशेष48/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.45/ए/1995	विशेष38/2012(नया) विशेष7/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.23/ए/1996	विशेष19/2012(नया) विशेष46/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.17/ए/2000	विशेष21/2012(नया) विशेष20/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.39/ए/2000 (धनबाद)	विशेष6/2012(नया) विशेष2/2007(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.33/ए/2010	विशेष18/2012(नया) विशेष4/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.1/ए/2011	विशेष41/2012	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.14/ए/2011	विशेष39/2012(नया) विशेष10/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.17/ए/2012	विशेष1/2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.34/ए/2012	विशेष2/2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.3/ए/2013	विशेष3/2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.23/ए/2013	विशेष5/2014	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.25/ए/2013	विशेष5/2013	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.27/ए/2013	विशेष3/2014	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.30/ए/2013	विशेष2/2014	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.2/ए/2015	विशेष3/2016	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.3/ए/2015	विशेष1/2015	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.28/ए/2015	विशेष2/2016	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी

		आरसी.34/ए/2015	विशेष1/2016	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.28/ए/2016	विशेष1/2019	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.34/ए/2016	विशेष2/2019(नया) विशेष3/2018(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.35/ए/2016	विशेष4/2018	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.6/ए/2017	विशेष1/2018(नया) विशेष1/2017(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.13/ए/2017	विशेष3/2019	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.14/ए/2017	विशेष7/2019(नया) विशेष3/2017(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.15/ए/2017	विशेष4/2019(नया) विशेष4/2017(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.18/ए/2017	विशेष6/2019(नया) विशेष5/2017(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.38/ए/2017	विशेष2/2020	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.39/ए/2017	विशेष1/2020(नया) विशेष2/2018(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.24/ए/2017	विशेष3/2020(नया) विशेष2/2019(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.1/ई/2008	विशेष23/2012(नया) विशेष12/2011(पुराना)	विशेष न्यायाधीश (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.38/एस/2001-कोल	एसटी-1/2013(नया) एससी-62/2006 (पुराना)	अपर सत्र न्यायाधीश, प्रथम त्वरित निपटान न्यायालय, सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.25/ए/1998	जीआर/571/1998	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.12/ए/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.2/एस/2011-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट सिलीगुडी
		आरसी.18/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट सिलीगुडी
	2.	आशीष मुखर्जी	आरसी-6/एस/2021-कोल, अन्वेषणाधीन	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बिष्णुपुर

		आरसी-18/एस/2021-कोल, अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बोलपुर
		आरसी-20/एस/2021-कोल,	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, रामपुरहाट
		आरसी-23/एस/2021-कोल,	-	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दुबराजपुर (बीरभूम)
		आरसी-24/एस/2021-कोल,	-	अपर सत्र न्यायाधीश रामपुरहाट
		आरसी-25/एस/2021-कोल, अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बोलपुर
		आरसी-24/ए/2012	सी-105/2015(नया) जीआर- 59(सी)2015(पुराना)	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बांकुरा
		आरसी-13/ए/2013	सी-108/2014(नया) जीआर- 36(सी)2014(पुराना)	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बांकुरा
		आरसी-12/ए/2010	टीआर-145/2012	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-23/ए/2012	टीआर-110/2015	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-19/ए/2014	टीआर-705/2015	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-20/ए/2014	टीआर-598/2015	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-35/ए/2015	टीआर-446/2016	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-36/ए/2015	टीआर-544/2016	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-38/ए/2015	टीआर-667/2016	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-37/ए/2015	टीआर-582/2016	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
3.	पार्थ सार्थी दत्ता	आरसी-9/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बैरकपुर
		आरसी-16/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक

				मजिस्ट्रेट, बैरकपुर
		आरसी-27/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बैरकपुर
		आरसी-27/एस/2021-कोल	-	किशोरन्याय बोर्ड, सॉल्ट लेक, कोलकाता
		आरसी-35/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर जिला एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश-iv, बारासात
		आरसी-45/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारासात
		आरसी-48/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारासात
4.	गौर सुंदर मुखोपाध्याय	आरसी-10/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, तूफानगंज, कूचबिहार
		आरसी-14/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दिनहाटा, कूचबिहार
		आरसी-19/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, माथाभांगा
		आरसी-37/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, माथाभांगा
		आरसी-38/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर सत्र न्यायाधीश पोक्सो न्यायालय, मालदा
		आरसी-44/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बुनियादपुर (दक्षिण दिनाजपुर)
		आरसी-4/एस/2005-कोल	एससी-361/2014(नया) एसटी-2(09)/2011 (पुराना)	अपर सत्र न्यायाधीश (चतुर्थ न्यायालय) जलपाईगुडी
		आरसी-13/ई/2020-कोल	-	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, कूचबिहार
		आरसी-15/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दिनहाटा
		आरसी-10/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दिनहाटा
		आरसी-14/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दिनहाटा
5.	रवि शंकर	आरसी-13/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक

				मजिस्ट्रेट, डायमंडहार्वर
		आरसी-26/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, डायमंडहार्वर
		आरसी-28/एस/2021-कोल,	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-36/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-39/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, अलीपुर
		आरसी-42/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-2ए/2020	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-4ए/2020	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-7/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-8/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-9/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बारूईपुर
		आरसी-4/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, डायमंडहार्वर
		आरसी-6/ई/2020-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, काकद्वीप
6.	मृणाल कांती देब	आरसी-31/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, झाडग्राम
		आरसी-32/एस/2021-कोल	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया
		आरसी-33/एस/2021-कोल	-	विशेष न्यायाधीश (एससीएसटी) तमलूक, पूर्व मेदिनीपुर
		आरसी-41/एस/2021-कोल	-	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, झाडग्राम
		आरसी-46/एस/2021-कोल	-	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट (पश्चिमी) मेदिनीपुर
		आरसी-52/एस/2021-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, कोंटाई
		आरसी-1/एस/2022-कोल अन्वेषणाधीन	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया
		आरसी-6/एस/2009-कोल	जीआर-952/2009	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया
		आरसी-9/ए/2009-कोल	जीआर-373/2005	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक

				मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया
		आरसी-12/एस/1991-कोल,	जीआर-1/1992	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट II हल्दिया
		आरसी-20/ई/2020-कोल,	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, हल्दिया
		आरसी-19/ई/2020-कोल,	-	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, कोंटाई
7.	अविजीत बरन दास	आरसी-29/ए/2012	टीआर-2/2016	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-2/ई/2016-कोल,	टीआर-235/2016	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-27/ए/2012	टीआर-417/2015	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-06/ए/2010	टीआर-19/2012	अपर मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-25/ए/2011	-	किशोर न्याय बोर्ड दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-2/एस/2015-कोल,	एससी-20/2020	अपर जिला न्यायाधीश -1 दुर्गापुर
		आरसी-2/ई/2018-कोल,	जीआर-702/2018	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल
		आरसी-12/ए/2013-कोल,	सी-344/2015(नया) जीआर-35(सी)/2014 (पुराना)	मुख्य न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, बांकुडा
		आरसी-31/ए/1999	जीआर-1256/99	द्वितीय न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, आसनसोल

[फा. सं. 225/44/2022-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 2023

S.O. 732.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the Advocates specified in column (2) of the table below as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) mentioned against each in the said table and any appeal, revision or other matters arising out of those cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Name of Advocate (Sh./Smt.)	RC. No.	Court Case No.	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Ajay Chaudhuri	RC. 43/A/1988 (Partly Disposed Off Case)	Spl.17/2012(New) Spl.48/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri

	RC. 45/A/1995	Spl.38/2012(New) Spl.7/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC. 23/A/1996	Spl.19/2012(New) Spl.46/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.17/A/2000	Spl.21/2012(New) Spl.20/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.39/A/2000 (Dhanbad)	Spl.6/2012(New) Spl.2/2007(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.33/A/2010	Spl.18/2012(New) Spl.4/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.1/A/2011	Spl.41/2012	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.14/A/2011	Spl.39/2012(New) Spl.10/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.17/A/2012	Spl.1/2013	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.34/A/2012	Spl.2/2013	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.3/A/2013	Spl.3/2013	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.23/A/2013	Spl.5/2014	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.25/A/2013	Spl.5/2013	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.27/A/2013	Spl.3/2014	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.30/A/2013	Spl.2/2014	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.2/A/2015	Spl.3/2016	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.3/A/2015	Spl.1/2015	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.28/A/2015	Spl.2/2016	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.34/A/2015	Spl.1/2016	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.28/A/2016	Spl.1/2019	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.34/A/2016	Spl.2/2019(New) Spl.3/2018(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.35/A/2016	Spl.4/2018	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.6/A/2017	Spl.1/2018(New) Spl.1/2017(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.13/A/2017	Spl.3/2019	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.14/A/2017	Spl.7/2019(New) Spl.3/2017(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.15/A/2017	Spl.4/2019(New) Spl.4/2017(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.18/A/2017	Spl.6/2019(New) Spl.5/2017(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.38/A/2017	Spl.2/2020	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.39/A/2017	Spl.1/2020(New) Spl.2/2018(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.24/A/2017	Spl.3/2020(New) Spl.2/2019(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.1/E/2008	Spl.23/2012(New) Spl.12/2011(Old)	Special Judge (Central Bureau Of Investigation), Siliguri
	RC.38/S/2001-Kol	ST-1/2013(New)	Additional Sessions Judge, 1st

			SC-62/2006(Old)	Fast Track Court Siliguri
		RC-25/A/1998	GR-571/1998	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Siliguri
		RC-12/A/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Siliguri
		RC-2/S/2011-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Siliguri
		RC-18/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Siliguri
2	Ashis Mukherjee	RC-6/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Bishnupur
		RC-18/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Bolpur
		RC-20/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Rampurhat
		RC-23/S/2021-Kol	-	Judicial Magistrate Dubrajpur (Birbhum)
		RC-24/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Sessions Judge Rampurhat
		RC-25/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Bolpur
		RC-24/A/2012	C-105/2015 (New) GR-59 (C) 2015(Old)	Chief Judicial Magistrate Bankura
		RC-13/A/2013	C-108/2014 (New) GR-36(C) 2014(Old)	Chief Judicial Magistrate Bankura
		RC-12/A/2010	TR-145/2012	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-23/A/2012	TR-110/2015	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-19/A/2014	TR-705/2015	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-20/A/2014	TR-598/2015	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-35/A/2015	TR-446/2016	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-36/A/2015	TR-544/2016	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-38/A/2015	TR-667/2016	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-37/A/2015	TR-582/2016	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
3	Partha Sarathi Dutta	RC-9/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barrackpore
		RC-16/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barrackpore
		RC-27/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barrackpore
		RC-27/S/2021-Kol	-	Juvenile Justice Board, Salt Lake, Kolkata
		RC-35/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional District & Sessions Judge-Iv, Barasat
		RC-45/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barasat
		RC-48/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Chief Judicial Magistrate Barasat
4	Gour Sundar Mukhopadhyay	RC-10/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Tufanganj, Coochbehar
		RC-14/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dinhata, Coochbehar
		RC-19/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Mathabhanga
		RC-37/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Mathabhanga

		RC-38/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Sessions Judge, 2 nd POCSO Court, Maldah
		RC-44/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Buniadpur (South Dinajpur)
		RC-4/S/2005--Kol	SC-361/2014 (New) ST-2(09)/2011 (Old)	Additional Sessions Judge (4 th Court) Jalpaiguri
		RC-13/E/2020-Kol	-	Chief Judicial Magistrate Coochbehar
		RC-15/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Dinhata
		RC-10/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Dinhata
		RC-14/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Dinhata
5	Ravi Shankar	RC-13/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Diamondharbour
		RC-26/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Diamondharbour
		RC-28/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		Rc-36/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-39/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Alipore
		RC-42/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-2/A/2020	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-4/A/2020	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-7/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-8/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-9/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Baruipur
		RC-4/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Diamondharbour
		RC-6/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Kakdwip
6	Mrinal Kanti Deb	RC-31/S/2021-Kol Under Investigation	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Jhargram
		RC-32/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia
		RC-33/S/2021-Kol	-	Special Judge (SCST), Tamluk, Purba Medinipore
		RC-41/S/2021-Kol	-	Chief Judicial Magistrate Jhargram
		RC-46/S/2021-Kol	-	Chief Judicial Magistrate Paschim Medinipore
		RC-52/S/2021-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial

		Under Investigation		Magistrate Contai
		RC-1/S/2022-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia
		RC-6/S/2009-Kol	GR-952/2009	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia
		RC-9/A/2005	GR-373/2005	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia
		RC-12/S/1991-Kol	Gr-1/1992	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate- II, Haldia
		RC-20/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Haldia
		RC-19/E/2020-Kol	-	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Contai
7	Avijit Baran Das	RC-29/A/2012	TR-2/2016	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Durgapur
		RC-2/E/2016-Kol	TR-235/2016	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Durgapur
		RC-27/A/2012	TR-417/2015	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Durgapur
		RC-6/A/2010	TR-19/2012	Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Durgapur
		RC-25/A/2011	-	Juvenile Justice Board, Durgapur.
		RC-2/S/2015-Kol	SC-20/2020	Additional District Judge-1, Durgapur
		RC-2/E/2018-Kol	GR-702/2018	Chief Judicial Magistrate Asansol
		RC-12/A/2013	C-344/2015(New) GR-35(C)/2014 (Old)	Chief Judicial Magistrate Bankura
		RC-31/A/1999	GR-1256/99	2 nd JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE Asansol

[F. No. 225/44/2022-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 733.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री एस. वी. राजू, भारत के अपर महा-सालिसिटर को, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) की ओर से माननीय कलकत्ता उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष (i) सीबीआई बनाम गुरुपद माझी और अन्य आरसी 22/2020 (अनूप माझी कोयला घोटाला मामला) से संबंधित 2022 का सीआरएम (डीबी) सं0 231; और (ii) 2022 का सीआरआर सं. 2164, सीबीआई और अन्य बनाम पश्चिमी बंगाल राज्य और अन्य तथा 2022 के बिश्नुपुर पुलिस थाना, डायमंड हार्बर पुलिस जिला प. बं. पुलिस मामला सं. 361 से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों के संचालन के लिए भी, उनके कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख 28.04.2022 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या अध्यधीन मामलों के निपटारे तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/46/2022-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th February, 2024

S.O. 733.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. V. Raju, Additional Solicitor General of India as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the (i) CRM (DB) No. 231 of 2022, CBI vs. Gurupada Majhi and Others pertaining to RC 22/2020 (Anup Majhee Coal Scam Case); and (ii) CRR No. 2164 of 2022, CBI and Another vs. State of West Bengal and Another and also proceedings pertaining to W.B. Police Case No. 361 of 2022 of Bishnupur Police Station, Diamond Harbour Police District, on behalf of Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central

Bureau of Investigation) before the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, for a period of three years with effect from 28.04.2022 or till disposal of the subject cases, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/46/2022-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 7 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 734.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1973 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री रवि शंकर, वरिष्ठ अधिवक्ता को नीचे सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों का, उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (3) में उल्लिखित न्यायालयों में और इन मामलों से उद्भूत किसी अपील, पुनरीक्षण और अन्य मामलों में तत्समय प्रवृत्त किसी विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में, अभियोजन का संचालन करने हेतु प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है: -

क्र.सं.	आरसी संख्या	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	आरसी-7(ए)/1997-डी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
2.	आरसी-9(ए)/1997-डी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
3.	आरसी-10(ए)/1997-डी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
4.	आरसी-11(ए)/1997-डी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
5.	आरसी-12(ए)/1997-डी	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
6.	आरसी-11 (ए)/2009-एएचडी-आर	विशेष न्यायाधीश, पीएमएलए, रांची
7.	आरसी-14 (ए)/2009-एएचडी-आर	विशेष न्यायाधीश, पीएमएलए, रांची
8.	आरसी-4 (ए)/2010-एएचडी-आर (एफ)	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
9.	आरसी-4 (ए)/2010-एएचडी-आर (जी)	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची
10.	आरसी-4 (ए)/2010-एएचडी-आर (एच)	विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, रांची

[फा. सं. 225/14/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 7th February, 2024

S.O. 734.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Ravi Shankar, Senior Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) mentioned in column (2) of the table below, in the Courts mentioned in column (3) of the said table and any appeal, revision or other matters arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier, namely: -

Sl. No.	RC No.	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	RC-7(A)/1997-D	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
2	RC-9(A)/1997-D	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
3	RC-10(A)/1997-D	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi

4	RC-11(A)/1997-D	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
5	RC-12(A)/1997-D	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
6	RC-11(A)/2009-AHD-R	Special Judge, PMLA, Ranchi
7	RC-14(A)/2009-AHD-R	Special Judge, PMLA, Ranchi
8	RC-4(A)/2010-AHD-R(F)	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
9	RC-4(A)/2010-AHD-R(G)	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi
10	RC-4(A)/2010-AHD-R(H)	Special Judge, CBI, Ranchi

[F. No. 225/14/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 735.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री पी. एस. ईश्वरन, अधिवक्ता को, विशेष न्यायालय अर्नाकुलम-I, न्यायालय के समक्ष लंबित दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित सीबीआई के मामले आरसी 8(एस)/2016/सीबीआई/एससीबी/टीवीपीएम (पाय्योली मनोज हत्या का मामला) के अभियोजन तथा तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में इस मामले से उद्भूत किसी अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य विषय का संचालन करने के लिए, प्रभार संभालने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामले का निपटान होने तक, जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/27/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th February, 2024

S.O. 735.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. S. Easwaran, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of CBI case RC 8(S)/2016/CBI/SCB/TVPM (Payyoli Manoj Murder Case) instituted by Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), pending before the Court of Special Court Ernakulam-I and any appeal, revision or other matter arising out of this case in any appellate or revisional Court established by law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/27/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 736.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री प्रिय रंजन, अधिवक्ता को नीचे सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों का, उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (4) में उल्लिखित न्यायालयों में और इन मामलों से उद्भूत किसी अपील, पुनरीक्षण और अन्य मामलों में तत्समय प्रवृत्त किसी विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में, अभियोजन का संचालन करने हेतु प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजन नियुक्त करती है:

सारणी

क्र.सं.	आरसी संख्या	शाखा का नाम	न्यायालय का नाम
1.	आरसी0231987ए0010	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
2.	आरसी0241987एस0023	सीबीआई, एसीबी रांची	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
3.	आरसी0231992ए0044	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
4.	आरसी0231994एस0039	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
5.	आरसी0232001ए0015	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
6.	आरसी0232007ए0020	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
7.	आरसी0232008एस0015	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
8.	आरसी0232008एस0021	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
9.	आरसी023008ए0030	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
10.	आरसी0232009एस0029	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
11.	आरसी0232010ए0003	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
12.	आरसी0232010ए0004	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
13.	आरसी0232013ए0015	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर
14.	आरसी0232014ए0012	सीबीआई, एसीबी पटना	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट मुज़फ्फरपुर

[फा. सं. 225/35/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th February, 2024

S.O. 736.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Priya Ranjan, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) as mentioned in column (2) of the Table below, in the Courts mentioned in column (4) of the said Table and appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier, namely: -

TABLE

Sl. No.	RC No.	Name of the Branch	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	RC0231987A0010	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
2	RC0241987S0023	CBI ACB Ranchi	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
3	RC0231992A0044	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
4	RC0231994S0039	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
5	RC0232001A0015	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
6	RC0232007A0020	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
7	RC0232008S0015	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
8	RC0232008S0021	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
9	RC0232008A0030	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
10	RC0232009S0029	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
11	RC0232010A0003	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
12	RC0232010A0004	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur

13	RC0232013A0015	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
14	RC0232014A0012	CBI ACB Patna	Special Judicial Magistrate, Muzaffarpur

[F. No. 225/35/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 737.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री अरविन्द कुमार, अधिवक्ता को माननीय अपर जिला न्यायाधीश/विशेष न्यायाधीश, (सीबीआई) न्यायालय सं. 2, पटना के समक्ष लंबित, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित सीबीआई मामला आरसी-07(एस)/2004/सीबीआई/एससीआर-III/नई दिल्ली और तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा स्थापित अपीलीय या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में इस मामले से उत्पन्न किसी अपील, पुनरीक्षण अथवा अन्य मामले में अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए उनकी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा मामले के निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/16/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th February, 2024

S.O. 737.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Arvind Kumar, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of CBI Case RC 07(S)/2004/CBI/SCR-III/New Delhi instituted by Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), pending before the Court of Additional District Judge/Special Judge (CBI), Court No. 2, Patna and any appeal, revision or other matters arising out of this case in any appellate or revisional Court established by any law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/16/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 738.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री एस. वी. राजू, भारत के विद्वान अपर महासॉलीसिटर को माननीय उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) की ओर से दांडिक एम.सी. सं. 1331/2023 में अभियोजन का संचालन करने और सीबीआई मामला आरसी 04(ए)/2017/सीबीआई, एसी-III/नई दिल्ली (सीबीआई बनाम महेश अग्रवाल और अन्य) से संबंधित अन्य कार्यवाहियों के लिए, तारीख 20 मार्च, 2023 से मामले का निपटान होने तक, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/13/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th February, 2024

S.O. 738.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. V. Raju, Ld. Additional Solicitor General of India as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of the Criminal MC No. 1331/2023 and other proceedings pertaining to CBI case RC 04(A)/2017/CBI, AC-III/New Delhi (CBI vs Mahesh Agarwalla & Others) on behalf of Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi with effect from the 20th March, 2023 till disposal of the case.

[F. No. 225/13/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 739.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री अरविन्द कुमार, अधिवक्ता को त्वरित निपटान न्यायालय सं. 1, पटना दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना) केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो (द्वारा संस्थित सीबीआई मामला आरसी-2(एस)/(2003/सीबीआई/एससी-III/नई दिल्ली में, अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए उनकी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा मामले के निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/11/2021-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th February, 2024

S.O. 739.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Arvind Kumar, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of CBI case RC-2(S)/2003/CBI/SC-III/New Delhi, instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) in the Fast Track Court-I, Patna for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/11/2021-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 740.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री मुनिन च बरुआ, अधिवक्ता को माननीय विशेष न्यायाधीश न्यायालय, मादक औषधि और स्वापक पदार्थ, सोनितपुर, तेजपुर, असम के समक्ष लंबित दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा रजिस्ट्रीकृत सीबीआई मामला आरसी06/99/एसआईयू/-XI/ईओयू-V/नई दिल्ली से उत्पन्न किसी अभियोजन, अपील और अन्य कार्यवाहियों का संचालन करने के लिए उनकी नियुक्ति की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अनधिक अवधि के लिए अथवा मामले के निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/26/2023- एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th February, 2024

S.O. 740.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Munin Ch. Baruah, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution, appeal or other proceedings arising out of CBI case Number RC.06/99/SIU/-XI/EOU-V/New Delhi registered by Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the court of Special Judge, Narcotic Drug and Psychotropic Substance, Sonitpur, Tezpur, Assam, for a period not exceeding three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/26/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 741.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री एस. वी. राजू, भारत का अपर सालिसिटर जनरल को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) के निमित्त माननीय दिल्ली उच्च न्यायालय के समक्ष रिट याचिका (सिविल) सं. 9406/2020 (अशोक कुमार गौतम बनाम निदेशक, सीबीआई और अन्य) से उद्भूत अपील या अन्य कार्यवाहियों में अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए 6 अप्रैल, 2022 से या मामले का निपटान होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/17/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th February, 2024

S.O. 741.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. V. Raju, Additional Solicitor General of India as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution, appeal or other proceedings in or arising out of the Writ Petition (Civil) No. 9406/2020 (Ashok Kumar Gautam Vs Director, CBI and others) on behalf of Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, for a period of three years with effect from the 6th April, 2022 or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/17/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 742.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री करण आनंद, अधिवक्ता को माननीय उत्तराखंड उच्च न्यायालय, नैनीताल के समक्ष दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा रजिस्ट्रीकृत सीबीआई मामला संख्या आरसी एसी 1 2019ए 0005 से उत्पन्न अभियोजन, अपील या अन्य कार्यवाहियों का संचालन करने हेतु कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से उस अवधि तक जो तीन वर्षों से अधिक नहीं होगी या मामले के निपटान होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/23/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 2024

S.O. 742.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Karan Anand, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution, appeal or other proceedings relating to CBI case RC. AC1 2019 A 0005 on behalf of Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the Hon'ble High Court of Uttarakhand at Nainital for a period not exceeding three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the case, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/23/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 743.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्रीमती कविता पाटिल, अधिवक्ता को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों, जिन्हें नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) और स्तंभ (3) में वर्णित किया गया है, का उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (4) में वर्णित न्यायालयों में और किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय, जिसे विधि द्वारा स्थापित किया गया है, में ऐसे मामलों से उद्भूत होने वाली कोई अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों के अभियोजन संचालन के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान की तारीख तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है:-

क्र. सं.	आरसी.सं.	न्यायालय मामला सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	आरसी.9/ई/2000-मुंबई	7/सीपी/2003 (155/सीपीडब्ल्यू08) 766/पीडब्ल्यू/09 (अनुपूरक आरोप-पत्र)	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
2	आरसी.5/ई/2000-मुंबई	860/सीपी/2003 (699/पीडब्ल्यू/2009)	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई

3	आरसी.4/ई/2002- EOU.IX.ND	51/सीपीडब्ल्यू/06 926/पीडब्ल्यू/2009	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
4	आरसी.4/ई/2001-मुंबई	216/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2004 887/पीडब्ल्यू/2009	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
5	आरसी.8/ई/2002-मुंबई	735/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2009 138/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2006 (अनुपूरक आरोप-पत्र)	एवं एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
6	आरसी.12/ई/2003-मुंबई	984/पीडब्ल्यू/2014	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
7	आरसी.1/ई/2004-मुंबई	112/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2006 (724/पीडब्ल्यू/09)	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
8	आरसी.11/ई/2004-मुंबई	864/पीडब्ल्यू/2014	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
9	आरसी.8/ई/2005-मुंबई	266/पीडब्ल्यू/2015	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
10	आरसी.4/ई/2004-मुंबई	202/पीडब्ल्यू/2008	एसीएमएम 3 ^{रा} न्यायालय, मुंबई
11	आरसी.10/ई/2004-मुंबई	1/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2006 (767/पीडब्ल्यू/09)	एसीएमएम 19 ^{वां} न्यायालय, मुंबई
12	आरसी.7/ई/2005-मुंबई	542/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2007	एसीएमएम 19 ^{वां} न्यायालय, मुंबई
13	आरसी.2/ई/2007-मुंबई	836/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2003	एसीएमएम 19 ^{वां} न्यायालय, मुंबई
14	आरसी.1/ई/2008-मुंबई	1041/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2008	एसीएमएम 19 ^{वां} न्यायालय, मुंबई
15	आरसी.9/ई/2008-मुंबई	1091/सीपीडब्ल्यू/2008	एसीएमएम 19 ^{वां} न्यायालय, मुंबई

[फा. सं. 225/25/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th February, 2024

S.O. 743.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Ms. Kavita Patil, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) mentioned column (2) and (3) of table below, in the Courts mentioned in column (4) of the said table and any appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of cases, whichever is earlier, namely: -

Sl. No.	RC. No.	Court Case No.	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	RC.9/E/2000-Mumbai	7/CP/2003 (155/CPW08) 766/PW/09 (Supplementary Chargesheet)	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai

2	RC.5/E/2000-Mumbai	860/CPW/2003 (699/PW/2009)	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
3	RC.4/E/2002-EOU.IX.ND	51/CPW/06 926/PW/2009	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
4	RC.4/E/2001-Mumbai	216/CPW/2004 887/PW/2009	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
5	RC.8/E/2002-Mumbai	735/CPW/2009 & 138/CPW/2006 (Supplementary Chargesheet)	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
6	RC.12/E/2003-Mumbai	984/PW/2014	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
7	RC.1/E/2004-Mumbai	112/CPW/2006 (724/PW/09)	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
8	RC.11/E/2004-Mumbai	864/PW/2014	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
9	RC.8/E/2005-Mumbai	266/PW/2015	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
10	RC.4/E/2004-Mumbai	202/PW/2008	ACMM 3 rd Court, Mumbai
11	RC.10/E/2004-Mumbai	1/CPW/2006 (767/PW/09)	ACMM 19 th Court, Mumbai
12	RC.7/E/2005-Mumbai	542/CPW/2007	ACMM 19 th Court, Mumbai
13	RC.2/E/2007-Mumbai	836/CPW/2003	ACMM 19 th Court, Mumbai
14	RC.1/E/2008-Mumbai	1041/CPW/2008	ACMM 19 th Court, Mumbai
15	RC.9/E/2008-Mumbai	1091/CPW/2008	ACMM 19 th Court, Mumbai

[F. No. 225/25/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 2024

का.आ. 744.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में वर्णित अधिवक्ताओं को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (3) और स्तंभ (5) प्रत्येक के सामने वर्णित मामलों के अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए पूर्वोक्त सारणी के (6) में वर्णित न्यायालयों में अभियोजन संचालित करने या किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय, जिसे तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय के रूप में स्थापित किया गया है, में ऐसे मामलों से उद्भूत होने वाली कोई अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों को संचालित करने के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान की तारीख तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वोक्त हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है:-

सारणी

क्रम सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम	आरसी. सं.	शाखा का नाम	न्यायालय मामला सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	दिनाकेर एम. वी.	आरसी 25(ए)/2013 आरसी 44(ए)/2013	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	03/2019	XI सीबीआई मामलों के लिए अपर विशेष

		आरसी 04(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		न्यायाधीश, चेन्नई
		आरसी 06(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 07(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 11(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 12(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 30(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 31(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 32(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 33(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 34(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 35(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई		
		आरसी 02(ए)/2004	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	11/2006 08/2018	
		आरसी 43(ए)/2005	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	09/2008	
		आरसी 09(ए)/2007	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	20/2009 39/2012	
		आरसी 44(ए)/2010	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	42/2011	
		आरसी 02(ए)/2013	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	16/2014	
		आरसी 03(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	21/2015	
		आरसी 55(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	01/2017	
		आरसी 37(ए)/2017	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	12/2020	
2	बी. आनंदन	आरसी 27(ए)/2008	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	28/2009	IX सीबीआई मामलों के लिए अपर विशेष न्यायाधीश, चेन्नई
		आरसी 33(ए)/2011	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	03/2013	
		आरसी 24(ए)/2012	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	36/2013	
		आरसी 20(ए)/2013	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	28/2015	
		आरसी 38(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	35/2017	
		आरसी 04(ए)/2020	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	06/2022	
		आरसी 06(ए)/2020	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	16/2022	
		आरसी 38(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	30/2015 31/2015 32/2015 33/2015 34/2015	XII सीबीआई मामलों के लिए अपर विशेष न्यायाधीश, चेन्नई
3.	रेवथी जी. मोहन	आरसी 01(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	25/2016	IX सीबीआई मामलों के लिए अपर विशेष न्यायाधीश, चेन्नई
		आरसी 16(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	08/2015	
		आरसी 03(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	24/2015	

		आरसी 21(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	39/2015	
		आरसी 42(ए)/2016	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	05/2018	
		आरसी 09(ए)/2017	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	04/2020	
		आरसी 12(ए)/2017	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	09/2019	
		आरसी 07(ए)/2018	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	15/2021	
		आरसी 08(ए)/2018	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	08/2020	
		आरसी 01(ए)/2020	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	08/2022	
			सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	10/2022	
			सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	11/2022	
		आरसी 27(ए)/2020	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	04/2023	
4.	एस. सिवारमन	आरसी 25(ए)/2012	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	03/2014	XII सीबीआई मामलों के लिए अपर विशेष न्यायाधीश, चेन्नई
		आरसी 45(ए)/2012	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	37/2013	
		आरसी 01(ए)/2013	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	15/2014	
		आरसी 36(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	29/2017	
		आरसी 51(ए)/2014	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	07/2016	
		आरसी 52(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	22/2017	
		आरसी 23(ए)/2016	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	05/2022	
		आरसी 15(ए)/2019	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	14/2022	
		आरसी 02(ए)/2020	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	16/2021	
		आरसी 14(ए)/2021	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	08/2023	
		आरसी 49(ए)/2015	सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई	23/2021	
				24/2021	
				25/2021	

[फा. सं. 225/42/2022-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th February, 2024

S.O. 744.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the Advocates mentioned in column (2) of the Table below as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) as mentioned against each in column (3) and (5) of the said Table, in the courts mentioned in column (6) of the aforesaid Table and any appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period not exceeding three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier, namely:-

TABLE

Sl. No.	Name of Advocate	RC. No.	Name of the Branch	Court Case No.	Name of the Court
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Dinaker M. V.	RC 25(A)/2013	CBI, ACB, Chennai	03/2019	XI Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases, Chennai
		RC 44(A)/2013	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 04(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 06(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai		

		RC 07(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 11(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 12(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 30(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 31(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 32(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 33(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 34(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 35(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai		
		RC 02(A)/2004	CBI, ACB, Chennai	11/2006 08/2018	
		RC 43(A)/2005	CBI, ACB, Chennai	09/2008	
		RC 09(A)/2007	CBI, ACB, Chennai	20/2009 39/2012	
		RC 44(A)/2010	CBI, ACB, Chennai	42/2011	
		RC 02(A)/2013	CBI, ACB, Chennai	16/2014	
		RC 03(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai	21/2015	
		RC 55(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	01/2017	
		RC 37(A)/2017	CBI, ACB, Chennai	12/2020	
2	V. Anandan	RC 27(A)/2008	CBI, ACB, Chennai	28/2009	IX Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases, Chennai
		RC 33(A)/2011	CBI, ACB, Chennai	03/2013	
		RC 24(A)/2012	CBI, ACB, Chennai	36/2013	
		RC 20(A)/2013	CBI, ACB, Chennai	28/2015	
		RC 38(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	35/2017	
		RC 04(A)/2020	CBI, ACB, Chennai	06/2022	
		RC 06(A)/2020	CBI, ACB, Chennai	16/2022	XII Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases Chennai
		RC 38(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai	30/2015 31/2015 32/2015 33/2015 34/2015	
3	Revathi Mohan G.	RC 01(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	25/2016	IX Additional Special Judge for CBI cases Chennai
		RC 16(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai	08/2015	
		RC 03(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	24/2015	
		RC 21(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	39/2015	
		RC 42(A)/2016	CBI, ACB, Chennai	05/2018	
		RC 09(A)/2017	CBI, ACB, Chennai	04/2020	
		RC 12(A)/2017	CBI, ACB, Chennai	09/2019	
		RC 07(A)/2018	CBI, ACB, Chennai	15/2021	
		RC 08(A)/2018	CBI, ACB, Chennai	08/2020	
		RC 01(A)/2020	CBI, ACB, Chennai	08/2022	
			CBI, ACB, Chennai	10/2022	
			CBI, ACB, Chennai	11/2022	
4	M. Sivaraman	RC 27(A)/2020	CBI, ACB, Chennai	04/2023	XII Additional Special Judge for CBI cases Chennai
		RC 25(A)/2012	CBI, ACB, Chennai	03/2014	
		RC 45(A)/2012	CBI, ACB, Chennai	37/2013	
		RC 01(A)/2013	CBI, ACB, Chennai	15/2014	
		RC 36(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai	29/2017	
		RC 51(A)/2014	CBI, ACB, Chennai	07/2016	
		RC 52(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	22/2017	
		RC 23(A)/2016	CBI, ACB, Chennai	05/2022	
		RC 15(A)/2019	CBI, ACB, Chennai	14/2022	
		RC 02(A)/2020	CBI, ACB, Chennai	16/2021	
		RC 14(A)/2021	CBI, ACB, Chennai	08/2023	
		RC 49(A)/2015	CBI, ACB, Chennai	23/2021 24/2021 25/2021	

[F. No. 225/42/2022-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 745.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में वर्णित अधिवक्ताओं को, उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (3) और स्तंभ (4) में प्रत्येक के सामने यथा वर्णित दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों, जो पूर्वोक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (5) में वर्णित न्यायालयों में और किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय जिसे विधि द्वारा स्थापित किया गया है, में इन मामलों से उद्भूत होने वाली अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों के अभियोजन के संचालन के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष से अनधिक की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात्:

सारणी

क्रम सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम सर्व/श्री/श्रीमति	नियमित मामला संख्यांक	न्यायालय मामला संख्यांक	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	श्री बोब्बा श्रीहरी प्रसाद चौधरी	आरसी 08/2012-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 31/2023	सीबीआई मामलों के लिए विशेष न्यायाधीश, विजयवाड़ा
		आरसी 04/2015-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 43/2022	
		आरसी 11/2014-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 44/2022	
		आरसी 04/2016-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 12/2023	
		आरसी 03/2016-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 45/2022	
		आरसी 06/2017-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 26/2023	
		आरसी 05/2018-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 53/2022	
		आरसी 11/2018-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 54/2022	
		आरसी 12/2018-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 24/2022	
		आरसी 01,02 और 03/2017-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 25/2022	
		आरसी 06/2018-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 26/2022	
		आरसी 10/2017-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 46/2022	
		आरसी 04/2017-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 48/2022	
		आरसी 10/2018-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 35/2022	
		आरसी 04/2019-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 06/2023	
		आरसी 10/2006-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 28/2023	
		आरसी 11/2006-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 29/2023	
		आरसी 11/2006-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 01/2023	
		आरसी 07/2014-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 32 एवं 33/2023	
		आरसी 15/2005-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	42/2022 55/2022 56/2022 57/2022	

			58/2022	5 वां अतिरिक्त महानगर मजिस्ट्रेट, विजयवाड़ा
		आरसी 11/2022-सीबीआई/वीएसपी	सीसी 36/2023	
		आरसी 03/2020-ईओबी/सीएचएन	सीसी 05/2022	
		आरसी 11/2018-एचवाईडी/वीएसपी	सीसी 217/2023	
2.	एम. रामा प्रसाद बाबू	आरसी 04/2014-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 14/2022	सीबीआई मामलों के लिए विशेष न्यायाधीश, विजयवाड़ा
		आरसी 13/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 15/2022	
		आरसी 16/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 16/2022	
		आरसी 11/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 17/2022	
		आरसी 11/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 18/2022	
		आरसी 11/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 19/2022	
		आरसी 12/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 23/2022	
		आरसी 14/2004-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 02/2022	
		आरसी 01/2016-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 47/2022	
		आरसी 09/2010-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 09/2023	
		आरसी 07/2017-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 25/2023	
		आरसी 09/2011-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 03/2023	
		आरसी 06/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 04/2023	
		आरसी 19/2008-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 02/2023 और 34/2023	
		आरसी 15/2008-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 225/2023	5 वां अतिरिक्त महानगर मजिस्ट्रेट, विजयवाड़ा
		आरसी 14/2010-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 224/2023	
		आरसी 07/2004-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 1530/2005	
		आरसी 24/2006-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 221/2023	
		आरसी 21/2006-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 769/2008	
		आरसी 03/2010-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 3804/2019	
		आरसी 13/2016-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 160/2018	
		आरसी 17/2016-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 220/2023	
3	पोलीसेट्टी सोभना लक्ष्मी	आरसी 06/2017-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 26/2023	सीबीआई मामलों के लिए विशेष न्यायाधीश, विजयवाड़ा
		आरसी 04/2013-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 07/2023	
		आरसी 09/2014-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 11/2023	
		आरसी 05/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 13/2023	
		आरसी 19/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 04/2022	

	आरसी 01/2014-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 05/2023	5 वां अतिरिक्त महानगर मजिस्ट्रेट, विजयवाड़ा
	आरसी 19/2006-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 41/2022	
	आरसी 04/2020-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 905/2023	
	आरसी 03/2021-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 906/2023	
	आरसी 04/2014-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 204/2023	
	आरसी 14/2021-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 210/2023	
	आरसी 15/2021-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 203/2023	
	आरसी 27/2006-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 01/2018	
	आरसी 02/2015-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 101/2017	
	आरसी 05(एस)/2020-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 218/2023	
	आरसी 05/2021-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 209/2023	
	आरसी 05 (ई)/2009-ईओडब्ल्यू /सीएचएन	सीसी 833/2011 और सीसी 2076/ 2018	
	आरसी 11/2021-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 1840/2022	
	आरसी 03/2001-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 1741/2022	
	आरसी 18/2005-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 476/2023	
	आरसी 08/2013-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 223/2023	
	आरसी 14/2020-सीबीआई /वीएसपी	सीसी 1829/2022	

[फा. सं. 225/21/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th March, 2024

S.O. 745.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the Advocates mentioned in column (2) of the Table below as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of cases instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) as mentioned against each in column (3) and (4) of the said Table, in the courts mentioned in column (5) of the aforesaid Table and appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, for a period not exceeding three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier, namely:

TABLE

Sl. No.	Name of Advocate S/Shri /Smt.	Regular Case Numbers	Court Case Number	Name of the Courts
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Bobba Srihari Prasad Chowdary	RC 08/2012-CBI/VSP	CC 31/2023	Special Judge for CBI Cases, Vijayawada
		RC 04/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 43/2022	
		RC 11/2014-CBI/VSP	CC 44/2022	
		RC 04/2016-CBI/VSP	CC 12/2023	
		RC 03/2016-CBI/VSP	CC 45/2022	
		RC 06/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 26/2023	
		RC 05/2018-CBI/VSP	CC 53/2022	
		RC 11/2018-CBI/VSP	CC 54/2022	

		RC 12/2018-CBI/VSP	CC 24/2022	
		RCs. 01, 02 & 03/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 25/2022	
		RC 06/2018-CBI/VSP	CC 26/2022	
		RC 10/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 46/2022	
		RC 04/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 48/2022	
		RC 10/2018-CBI/VSP	CC 35/2023	
		RC 04/2019-CBI/VSP	CC 06/2023	
		RC 10/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 28/2023	
		RC 11/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 29/2023	
		RC 11/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 01/2023	
		RC 07/2014-CBI/VSP	CC 32 & 33/2023	
		RC 15/2005-CBI/VSP	42/2022, 55/2022, 56/2022, 57/2022, 58/2022	
		RC 11/2022-CBI/VSP	CC 36/2023	
		RC 03(E)/2020-EOB/CHN	CC 05/2022	
		RC 11/2018-HYD/VSP	CC 217/2023	Vth Additional Metro - politan Magistrate, Vijayawada
2	M. Rama Prasad Babu	RC 04/2014-CBI/VSP	CC 14/2022	Special Judge for CBI Cases, Vijayawada
		RC 13/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 15/2022	
		RC 16/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 16/2022	
		RC 11/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 17/2022	
		RC 11/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 18/2022	
		RC 11/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 19/2022	
		RC 12/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 23/2022	
		RC 14/2004-CBI/VSP	CC 02/2022	
		RC 01/2016-CBI/VSP	CC 47/2022	
		RC 09/2010-CBI/VSP	CC 09/2023	
		RC 07/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 25/2023	
		RC 09/2011-CBI/VSP	CC 03/2023	
		RC 06/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 04/2023	
		RC 19/2008-CBI/VSP	CC 02/2023 & 34/2023	
		RC 15/2008-CBI/VSP	CC 225/2023	Vth Additional Metro- politan Magistrate, Vijayawada
		RC 14/2010-CBI/VSP	CC 224/2023	
		RC 07/2004-CBI/VSP	CC 1530/2005	
		RC 24/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 221/2023	
		RC 21/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 769/2008	
		RC 03/2010-CBI/VSP	CC 3804/2019	
		RC 13/2016-CBI/VSP	CC 160/2018	
		RC 17/2016-CBI/VSP	CC 220/2023	
		RC 13/2020-CBI/VSP	CC 1830/2022	
		RC 07/2016-HYD/VSP	CC 1107/2023	
3	Polisetty Lakshmi Sobhana	RC 06/2017-CBI/VSP	CC 26/2023	Special Judge for CBI Cases, Vijayawada
		RC 04/2013-CBI/VSP	CC 07/2023	
		RC 09/2014-CBI/VSP	CC 11/2023	
		RC 05/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 13/2023	
		RC 19/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 04/2022	
		RC 01/2014-CBI/VSP	CC 05/2023	
		RC 19/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 41/2022	
		RC 04/2020-CBI/VSP	CC 905/2023	Vth Additional Metro- politan Magistrate Vijayawada
		RC 03/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 906/2023	
		RC 04/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 204/2023	
		RC 14/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 210/2023	
		RC 15/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 203/2023	
		RC 27/2006-CBI/VSP	CC 01/2018	

	RC 02/2015-CBI/VSP	CC 101/2017
	RC 05(S)/2020-CBI/VSP	CC 218/2023
	RC 05/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 209/2023
	RC 05(E)/2009-EOW/CHN	CC 833/2011 & CC 2076/2018
	RC 11/2021-CBI/VSP	CC 1840/2022
	RC 03/2001-CBI/VSP	CC 1741/2022
	RC 18/2005-CBI/VSP	CC 476/2023
	RC 08/2013-CBI/VSP	CC 223/2023
	RC 14/2020-CBI/VSP	CC 1829/2022

[F. No. 225/21/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 2024

का.आ. 746.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री वी. एस. शुक्ला, अधिवक्ता को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित मामलों, जिन्हें नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में वर्णित किया गया है, के उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (4) में वर्णित न्यायालयों में अभियोजन संचालित करने या किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय, जिसे तत्समय प्रवृत्त विधि द्वारा अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय के रूप में स्थापित किया गया है, में ऐसे मामलों से उद्भूत होने वाली कोई अपील, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों को संचालित करने के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान की तारीख तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

सारणी

क्रम सं.	आरसी. सं.	सी. सी. सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (अनिल कुमार जैन और अन्य)	3/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
2.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (मनवीर सिंह और अन्य)	2/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
3.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (मैसर्स बालाजी हाईटेक कंस्ट्रक्शन प्राईवेट लिमिटेड)	1/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
4.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (मैसर्स पंकज उपाध्याय और अन्य)	6/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
5.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (मैसर्स देवेन्द्र सिंह और अन्य)	5/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
6.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (मैसर्स विनोद कुमार पांडेय और अन्य)	04/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
7.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम चंदर प्रकाश डिमरी और अन्य)	12/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
8.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम नीरज अग्रवाल और अन्य)	11/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद

9.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम अंकुर भसीन और अन्य)	10/2020	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
10.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (हरप्रीत सिंह सहगल और अन्य)	06/2021	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
11.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सत्य देव सिंह और अन्य)	03/2021	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
12.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम बी. एल. मीणा और अन्य)	06/2021	विशेष न्यायाधीश गाजियाबाद
13.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम निकुन दुदेजा)	78/2023	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
14.	आरसी 219 2017 ई0017 (सीबीआई बनाम जय शंकर साही और अन्य)	13/2023	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
15.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम सलिल बरगोटी और अन्य)	05/2021	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
16.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम मजहर अली और अन्य)	04/2021	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
17.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम राजेन्द्र गुप्ता, प्रोप. मैसर्स, आर. के. ट्रेडर्स और अन्य)	38/2021	विशेष न्यायाधीश, राउज एवेन्यू जिला न्यायालय, नई दिल्ली
18.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम मोहम्मद जमील प्रोप. मैसर्स कलेक्शन ब्रास इम्पेक्स और अन्य)	9/2021	विशेष न्यायाधीश गाजियाबाद
19.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम धंजन पाठक, प्रोप. सरोज इंटरप्राइजेज)	8/2021	विशेष न्यायाधीश गाजियाबाद
20.	आरसी 3(ई) 2006 ईओडब्ल्यू-1 (सीबीआई बनाम वागीश कुमार शर्मा, प्रोप. मैसर्स सदाशिव एक्सपोर्ट्स और अन्य)	10/2021	विशेष न्यायाधीश गाजियाबाद
21.	आरसी 2019 2016 ई0008- मैसर्स सीवीएस स्टील प्राइवेट लिमिटेड	6/2018	विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, गाजियाबाद
22.	आरसी 219 2019 ई0004 (मैसर्स एच. के.)	4/2022	विशेष न्यायाधीश गाजियाबाद

[फा. सं. 225/33/2023-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st March, 2024

S.O. 746.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri V. S. Shukla, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of cases mentioned in column (2) of the Table below, instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) before the courts mentioned in column (4) of the said Table and any appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional court established by any law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier.

TABLE

Sl. No.	RC Nos.	CC Nos.	Name of the Courts
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (Anil Kumar Jain and Ors.)	3/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
2.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (Manveer Singh and Ors.)	2/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
3.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (M/s Balaji Hitech Constructions Pvt. Ltd.)	1/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
4.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (M/s Pankaj Upadhyay and Ors.)	6/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
5.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (M/s Devender Singh and Ors.)	5/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
6.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (M/s Vinod Kumar Pandey and Ors.)	04/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
7.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI Vs Chander Prakash Dimri and Ors.)	12/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
8.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI vs Neeraj Agarwal and Ors.)	11/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
9.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI vs Ankur Bhasin and Ors.)	10/2020	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
10.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (Harpreet Singh Saigal and Ors.)	06/2021	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
11.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (Satya Deo Singh and Ors.)	03/2021	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
12.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI v/s B. L. Meena and Others.)	06/2021	Special Judge, Ghaziabad
13.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI v/s Nikun Dudeja)	78/2023	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
14.	RC 219 2017 E0017 (CBI v/s Jai Shankar Sahi and Ors.)	13/2023	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
15.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Salil Bargoti and others)	05/2021	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
16.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Mazhar Ali and others)	04/2021	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad
17.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Rajinder Gupta, Prop. of M/s R. K. Traders and Ors.)	38/2021	Special Judge, Rouse Avenue District Court, New Delhi
18.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Mohd. Jameel Prop. M/s Collection Brass Impex. and Ors.)	9/2021	Special Judge Ghaziabad
19.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Dhanjan Pathak, Prop. Saroj Enterprises)	8/2021	Special Judge Ghaziabad
20.	RC 3(E) 2006 EOW-I (CBI V/s Vagish Kumar Sharma, Prop. M/s Sadashiv Exports and Ors.)	10/2021	Special Judge Ghaziabad
21.	RC 2019 2016 E0008-M/s CVS Steels Pvt. Ltd.	6/2018	Special Judicial Magistrate, Ghaziabad.
22.	RC 219 2019 E0004 (M/s H. K.)	4/2022	Special Judge Ghaziabad

[F. No. 225/33/2023-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 747.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे सारणी के स्तंभ (1) में वर्णित अधिवक्ताओं को, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (2), स्तंभ (4) और स्तंभ (5) में वर्णित मामलों को उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (6) में वर्णित न्यायालयों के सामने और तत्समय प्रवृत्त किसी विधि के अधीन स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में इन मामलों से उद्भूत होने वाली किसी अपील पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों के अभियोजन के संचालन के लिए प्रभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि की अवधि के लिए या मामलों के निपटान तक, इन में से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

सारणी

क्र. सं.	अधिवक्ता का नाम (सर्व/श्री/श्रीमति)	आर सी सं.	शाखा का नाम	शीर्षक	सीसी. सं.	न्यायालय का नाम
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	अनु तुली	आरसी0962011ए0002	केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो, भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी ब्यूरो, शिमला	सीबीआई बनाम राजेश ठाकुर एवं अन्य	2013 का 2-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962012ए0002		सीबीआई बनाम अभिषेक गोयल एवं अन्य	2014 का 97-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962012ए0010		सीबीआई बनाम जे. के. नारंग एवं अन्य	2015 का 4-एस/7	विशेष न्यायाधीश (पीएमएलए)-सह-जिला एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, शिमला
		आरसी0962016ए0004		सीबीआई बनाम राजेश मुख्यान एवं अन्य	2017 का 1- एस/7	विशेष न्यायाधीश (पीएमएलए)-सह-जिला एवं सत्र न्यायाधीश, शिमला
		आरसी0962016ए0005		सीबीआई बनाम सुरजीत एवं अन्य	2020 का 104-40	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962016ए0008		सीबीआई बनाम मैसर्स हिलक्रेस्ट फूड प्रा. लि. एवं अन्य	2022 का 7- एस/7	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला
		आरसी0962016ए0008		सीबीआई बनाम मैसर्स रिसोर्स फूड प्रा. लि. एवं अन्य	2022 का 8- एस/7	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला
2	सुमन ठाकुर	आरसी0962017ए0004	केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो, भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी ब्यूरो, शिमला	सीबीआई बनाम तेज राम वर्मा एवं अन्य	2019 का 111-2	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला
		आरसी0962012ए0011		सीबीआई बनाम बाम देव शर्मा एवं अन्य	2014 का 18- एस/7	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला

		आरसी0962013ए0001	शिमला	सीबीआई बनाम दिनेश कुमार एवं अन्य	2015 का 46-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962013ए0001		सीबीआई बनाम मेहर चंद एवं अन्य	2015 का 39-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962013ए0001		सीबीआई बनाम परमजीत	2016 का 35-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962014ए0006		सीबीआई बनाम अनिल शर्मा एवं अन्य	2016 का 12-एस/7	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला
		आरसी0962016ए0006		सीबीआई बनाम डेविस वैल्यू कार्ड एवं अन्य	2018 का 23-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
3	संदीप शर्मा	आरसी0962017एस0005	केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो,	सीबीआई बनाम प्यारे लाल एवं अन्य	2019 का 141-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962017एस0006	भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी ब्यूरो	सीबीआई बनाम हेमराज एवं अन्य	2019 का 200-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962017एस0006	शिमला	सीबीआई बनाम प्यारेलाल एवं अन्य	2019 का 199-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962018ए0001		सीबीआई बनाम हरभगवान प्रताप सक्सेना एवं अन्य	2022 का 2-एस/7	विद् विशेष न्यायाधीश सीबीआई, शिमला
		आरसी0962018एस0002		सीबीआई बनाम लालरोलीन सुन्गते एवं अन्य	2021 का 169-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)
		आरसी0962020ए0001		सीबीआई बनाम सैनसंस पल्प और पेपर एवं अन्य	2021 का 15-2	विद् सीजेएम-सह-विशेष न्यायिक मजिस्ट्रेट, (सीबीआई)

[फा. सं. 225/03/2024-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th April, 2024

S.O. 747.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints the following Advocates mentioned in column (1) in the Table below as Special Public Prosecutors for conducting prosecution of the cases mentioned in column (2), (4) and (5) of the said Table, instituted by the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) before the Courts mentioned in column (6) of the said Table and any appeal, revision or other matter arising out of these cases in any appellate or revisional court established under any law for the time being in force, for a period of three years from the date of assumption of charge or till disposal of the cases, whichever is earlier.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Name of the Advocate (S/Shri/Smt)	RC Nos.	Name of the Branch	Title	CC No	Name of Court
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Anu Tuli	RC0962011A0002	Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Shimla	CBI Vs Rajesh Thakur & Ors.	2-2 of 2013	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962012A0002		CBI Vs Abhishek Goyal & Ors.	97-2 of 2014	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962012A0010		CBI Vs J. K. Narang & Ors.	4-S/7 of 2015	Spl. Judge (PMLA) Cum-District & Sessions Judge, Shimla
		RC0962016A0004		CBI Vs Rajesh Mukhyan & Ors.	1-S/7 of 2017	Spl. Judge (PMLA) Cum-District & Sessions Judge, Shimla
		RC0962016A0005		CBI Vs Surjeet & Ors.	104-40 of 2020	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962016A0008		CBI Vs M/s Hillcrest Food Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.	7-S/7 of 2022	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
		RC0962016A0008		CBI Vs M/s Resource Food Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.	8-S/7 of 2022	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
2	Suman Thakur	RC0962017A0004	Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Shimla	CBI Vs Tej Ram Verma & Ors.	111-2 of 2019	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
		RC0962012A0011		CBI Vs Bam Dev Sharma & Ors.	18-S/7 of 2014	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
		RC0962013A0001		CBI Vs Dinesh Kumar & Ors.	46-2 of 2015	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962013A0001		CBI Vs Mehar Chand & Ors.	39-2 of 2015	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962013A0001		CBI Vs Paramjit	35-2 of 2016	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962014A0006		CBI Vs Anil Sharma & Ors.	12-S/7 of 2016	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
		RC0962016A0006		CBI Vs Davis Value Card & Ors.	23-2 of 2018	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
3	Sandeep Sharma	RC0962017S0005	Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption	CBI Vs Pyare Lal & Ors.	141-2 of 2019	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)

		RC0962017S0006	Bureau, Shimla	CBI Vs Hem Raj & Ors.	200-2 of 2019	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962017S0006		CBI Vs Pyare Lal & Ors.	199-2 of 2019	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962018A0001		CBI Vs Harbhagwan Pratap Saxena & Ors.	2-S/7 of 2022	Ld. Special Judge CBI, Shimla
		RC0962018S0002		CBI Vs Lalrolien Sungte & Ors.	169-2 of 2021	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)
		RC0962020A0001		CBI Vs Sainsons Pulp and Paper & Ors.	15-2 of 2021	Ld. CJM-cum-Special Judicial Magistrate, (CBI)

[F. No. 225/03/2024-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 748.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री अजय कुमार गुप्ता, अधिवक्ता को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित सीबीआई मामला सं. आरसी 2192017ई0010-ईओ-I, नई दिल्ली (मिजोरम डायरेक्ट मार्केटिंग लिमिटेड) का विशेष न्यायाधीश, सीबीआई, (सांसद/विधायक मामला) राउज ऐवेन्यू जिला न्यायालय, नई दिल्ली के समक्ष विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में किसी मामले से उद्भूत किन्हीं अपीलों, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों में पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से, मामले के निपटान तक या अगला आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, अभियोजन संचालित करने के लिए विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/11/2024-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 748.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Ajay Kumar Gupta, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of CBI Case RC 2192017E0010-EO-I (Mizoram Direct Marketing Ltd. case) instituted by Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) in the Court of Special Judge, CBI, (MPs/MLAs cases), Rouse Avenue District Court, New Delhi and appeals, revisions or other matters arising out of the case in any appellate or revisional court established by law, till disposal of the case or further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/11/2024-AVD.II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 749.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री एआर एल. सुन्दरसन, भारत के अपर सालिसिटर जनरल को रिट याचिका

सं. 2018 की 143 (पी. किशोर बनाम सचिव, भारत सरकार, गृह मंत्रालय और अन्य) जो आर.सी. सं. 33(ए)/2011, सीबीआई, एसीबी, चेन्नई से संबंधित है, का माननीय उच्च न्यायालय, मद्रास के समक्ष संचालन करने के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए 5 अप्रैल, 2023 से मामले का निपटान होने तक या अगला आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/12/2024-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 749.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri AR. L. Sundaresan, Additional Solicitor General of India, as Special Public Prosecutor to represent Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) for conducting Writ Petition No. 143 of 2018 (P. Kishore Vs. The Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs and Others) pertaining to RC No. 33(A)/2011, CBI, ACB, Chennai, before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, with effect from the 5th April, 2023 till disposal of the case or further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 225/12/2024-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 750.—केंद्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री देविन्द्र पाल सिंह, अधिवक्ता को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन (केंद्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो) द्वारा संस्थित सीबीआई मामला सं. आरसी2202022ई0007, सीबीआई, ईओ-II, नई दिल्ली (श्री लालू प्रसाद यादव और अन्य के विरुद्ध नौकरी घोटाले के लिए हुए) का राउज ऐवेन्यू जिला न्यायालय, नई दिल्ली, माननीय दिल्ली उच्च न्यायालय और भारत के माननीय उच्चतम न्यायालय के समक्ष विधि द्वारा स्थापित किसी अपील या पुनरीक्षण न्यायालय में किसी मामले से उद्भूत किन्हीं अपीलों, पुनरीक्षण या अन्य मामलों में पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से, मामले के निपटान तक या अगला आदेश होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पूर्वतर हो, अभियोजन संचालित करने के लिए विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/13/2024-एवीडी-II]

कुन्दन नाथ, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 750.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Davinder Pal Singh, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of CBI Case RC 2202022E0007, CBI, EO-II New Delhi (Land for Job Scam case against Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav and others) instituted by Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation), before the Rouse Avenue District Court, New Delhi, Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and any appeals, revisions or other matters arising out of the case in any appellate or revisional Court established by law, from the date of assumption of charge till disposal of the case or till further order, whichever is earliest.

[F. No. 225/13/2024-AVD-II]

KUNDAN NATH, Under Secy.

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 751.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार निदेशक, केंद्रीय रेशम बोर्ड, सीएसआर और टीआई, पंपोर, कश्मीर ; सदस्य सचिव, केंद्रीय रेशम बोर्ड, सीएसआर और टीआई, बंगलोर, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री अब्दुल हामिद खान, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह-श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या **161/2018**) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 10.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/188/2018-आईआर (डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 751.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 161/2018) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court -I, Chandigarh**, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Director , Central Silk Board , CSR & TI, Pampore, Kashmir ; The Member Secretary, Central Silk Board, CSR & TI, Bangalore, and Shri Abdul Hamid Khan, Worker**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 10.04.2024.

[No. L-42012/188/2018-IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.****Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer, Chandigarh.**

ID No. 161/2018

Registered On: 25.02.2019

Sh.Abdul Hamid Khan S/o Mohd Rajab Khan Pampore , Jammu & Kashmir - 192121

.....Workman

Versus

1. The Director, Central Silk Board , CSR & TI, Govt.Of India, Ministry of Textile Galander, NH44A, Pampore, Kashmir-192121
2. The Member Secretary, Central Silk Board, CSR & TI, Govt.Of India, Ministry of Textile Bangalore - 560068

.....Managements

AWARD**Passed On: 28.03.2024**

Central Government vide Notification No. L-42012/188/2018-IR(DU) dated 30.01.2019, under clause (d) of Sub-Section (1) sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the action of the The Director , Central Silk Board , CSR & TI, Govt. of India, Ministry of Textile Galander, NH44A, Pampore, Kashmir-192121 in terminating the services of Sh. Abdul Hamid Khan S/o Mohd Rajab Khan w.e.f. 01.01.2016 and not regularizing him thereafter is just, fair and legal ? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?”

1. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal the case was fixed for filing claim statement by workman but none is responding on behalf of workman.
2. Perused the file and it is found that the Several opportunities have already been given to the workman to file the claim statement but of no use. Which denotes that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merits as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice except to pass a ‘No Claim Award’. Accordingly, no claim award is passed in the present case for the non-prosecution of workman. File after completion be consigned in the record room.

3. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required under Section 17 of the ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, PO-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 752.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार क्षेत्रीय निदेशक, भारतीय पुरातत्व सर्वेक्षण, टीटी नगर, भोपाल (म.प्र.), के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और अध्यक्ष, भारतीय पुरातत्व सर्वेक्षण श्रमिक संघ, विदिशा (म.प्र.), के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या CGIT/LC/R/29/2018.) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 16.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/33/2018 -आईआर (डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 752.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/29/2018.) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Regional Director, Archaeological Survey of India, TT Nagar, Bhopal (M.P.), and The President, Archaeological Survey of India Workers Union, Vidisha (M.P.)**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 16.04.2024.

[No. L-42011/33/2018 -IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/29/2018

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

The President,

Archaeological Survey of India Workers Union,

R/o Kila Andar Near Water Tank,

Bais Darwaja Marg,

Vidisha (M.P.) – 464001

Workman

Versus

The Regional Director,

Archaeological Survey of India,

1st Floor, Office Hall, Inner Court Building,

GTB Complex, TT Nagar,

Bhopal (M.P.) – 462003

Management

AWARD**(Passed on this 02nd day of April-2024.)**

As per letter dated 14/05/2018 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number L-42011/33/2018 (IR(DU)) dt. 14/05/2018. The dispute under reference related to :-

“Whether the demand of Archaeological Survey of India Employees Union (ASIEU) of regularization or granting 1/30 status at par with MTS in respect of the workmen Shri Vasanta Bodade & 36 others (annexed in A), is fair, just & legal? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled to and what directions are necessary in the case? ”

After registering the case on reference received, notices were sent to the parties and were duly served on them. Time was allotted to the workman to submit his statement of claim. In spite of allotment of time and service of notice, the workman never turned up and submitted his statement of claim. Management also did not file its written statement of claim/ defence. No evidence was ever produced by any of the parties in this Tribunal.

The Initial burden to prove his claim is on the workman. Since the workman did not file any pleading nor did he file any evidence, in the absence of any evidence in support of holding the claim of workman not proved the reference deserves to be answered against the workman and is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In the light of this factual backdrop, holding that the claim of the workman is not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against the Workman and is answered accordingly.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K.SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

DATE: 02/04/2024

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 753.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रबंधक, लार्सन एंड टुब्रो फाइनेंस लिमिटेड (फैमिली क्रेडिट लिमिटेड), इंदिरा नगर, लखनऊ, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री अमित कुमार, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह-श्रम न्यायालय, लखनऊ पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या 35/2019) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 10.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-41012/27/2018 -आईआर (डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 753.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 35/2019) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Lucknow** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Manager, Larsen & Toubro Finance Ltd. (Family Credit Ltd.), Indira Nagar, Lucknow, and Shri Amit Kumar, Worker**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 10.04.2024.

[No. L-41012/27/2018 -IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW

PRESENT

JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR

PRESIDING OFFICER

I.D. No. 35/2019

Ref. No. L-41012/27/2018-IR (D-U) dt. 28.09.2018

Amit Kumar Vs. Larsen & Toubro

BETWEEN

Sri Amit Kumar S/o Sri S.K. Shrivastava

C- 2970, S-6, Rajajipuram Lucknow- 226017

AND

The Manager

Larsen & Toubro Finance Ltd. (Family Credit Ltd.)

A-16, First Floor, Indira Nagar

Lucknow-226016

AWARD

By an order dated 28.09.2018 appropriate authority referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal for adjudication.

“Whether the action of management of Larsen & Toubro Finance Limited in terminating the services of Sri Amit Kumar, who was employed as Sales Officer on 25.10.2013 & Terminated on 30.06.2016 by the said management is fair, just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

Accordingly ID case No. 35/2019 registered before this Tribunal.

Claim statement Supported by an affidavit filed on behalf of appellant/workman, relevant portion of the same reads as under:-

1. *That the workman namely Amit Kumar Srivastava was employed as Sales Officer in your company who comes under the category of worker. He was neither employed as managerial or administrative capacity therefore as per section 2(s) of Industrial Dispute is well covered under the definition of workman, hence the order of reference is maintainable so far as relate to concerning workman.*
That applicant was appointed as Sales Officer in L & T Finance Limited (Family Credit Ltd.) A 16 First Floor, Indira Nagar Near Stallion Honda Showroom, Faizabad Road Lucknow 226016 w.e.f. 25.10.2023.
2. *That the applicant continuously work in the aforesaid establishment on the same post till 30.06.2016.*
3. *That the workman was paid salary by the opposite party through State Bank of India.*
4. *That the monthly salary of the applicant was Rs. 9437/- per month which was paid to him till 30.06.2016*
5. *That after the above termination the workman continuously about a week personally met with the employer of the opposite party and requested to take him back in employment all went in vain.*
6. *That the workman as per facts stated above has worked in the establishment continuously more than 3 years and also worked more than 240 days in every calendar year as well as in 12 month as **Annexure No. 1 and 2.***
7. *That the work and conduct of the applicant during his whole tenure of working period was unblemished and satisfactory, nothing adverse was ever communicated to him.*
8. *That the service of the applicant have verbally been terminated w.e.f. 30.06.2016 due to persistent demand of his unpaid salary.*

9. *That the above said verbal termination has been done by the opposite party without the compliance of mandatory provision of section 25(F) of Industrial Dispute Act as the workman before terminated neither has been given one month notice nor one month salary in lieu thereof nor any compensation.*
10. *That the opposite party have also not adopted the principle of first come last go which is also against the Provision of section 25 G Industrial Dispute Act.*
11. *That the opposite party has also contravened the provision of section 25H of Industrial Dispute Act as new person after termination of workman has been appointed. Without calling back the retrenched workman for appointment.*
13. *That the aforesaid termination order as per above facts in without compliance of labour laws, and illegal therefore, is liable to be set aside.*
14. *That the above workman under the above circumstances is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.*
15. *That the opposite party therefore, be directed to take the workman back in employment with full back wages along with continuity of service and all other service benefits.*
16. *That the workman after termination has regularly trying for other job but in spite of his best efforts he could not get the same till date.*
17. *That still he is unemployed and missing to join the opposite party.*
18. *That the applicant is still out of employment without any other source of income.*
19. *That the applicant under the above facts and circumstances is legally entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits with continuity of service.*

Accordingly it is prayed

On the basis of facts and circumstances, stated it is most respectfully prayed the reference order so received from the government kindly be decided in favour of the workman reinstating him back in service from the date of above illegal termination with full back wages continuity of service and all other consequential benefits along with the cost of case.

On 07.09.2022 an order was passed held as under:-

Case called out.

Parties absent.

Office is directed to issue notice to OP to file written statement on or before the next date of hearing.

List on 18.11.2022 for WS.

On 27.12.2022 an order was passed held as under:

Case called out.

Parties absent.

Last opportunity is granted for written statement.

List on 23.03.2023.

On 23.03.2023 an order was passed held as under:

Matter taken up in revised list.

Parties absent.

In spite of last opportunity written statement is filed, accordingly opportunity to file WS is closed.

List on 09.06.2023 for WEE (affidavit) along with relevant documents.

On 09.06.2023 an order was passed held as under:

Matter taken up in revised list.

Parties absent.

Another opportunity is granted file WE (affi.) along with documents.

List on 31.08.2023.

31.08.2023 an order was passed held as under:-
As Bar is on strike.

Matter is adjourned today.

List on 26.09.2023 for WVE (affidavit) along with documents.

26.09.2023 an order was passed held as under:-

Matter taken up in revised list.

Parties absent.

Last opportunity is granted for WE (affi.)

List on 25.01.2024. none to parties.

On 25.01.2024 an order was passed held as under:

None claim, when the case is taken in the revised list.

So opportunity to file workman evidence on affidavit is closed.

List for ex-parte hearing on 13.03.2024

Office is directed to issue notice to claimant.

Taking into consideration the above said facts as well as law no affidavit has been filed in support of claim petition.

Accordingly workman's claim rejected.

Award as above.

Lucknow.

20.03.2024

Justice ANIL KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 754.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार महाप्रबंधक, भारत संचार निगम लिमिटेड, हिसार डिवीजन, हिसार, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्रीमती बेदो देवी@वेदो देवी, कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह-श्रम न्यायालय-2, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 64/2020) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 19.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42025/07/2024 -63-आईआर (डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 754.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 64/2020) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court -2, Chandigarh**, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Ganeral Manager, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Hisar Division, Hisar, and Smt Bedo Devi@vedo Devi, Worker**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 10.04.2024.

[No. L-42025/07/2024-63-IR (DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE
IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer.

ID No. 64/2020

Registered on:-16.11.2020

Bedo Devi@ Vedo Devi W/o Inder Singh, R/o H.No.98, Navdeep Colony, Azad Nagar, Hisar(Haryana).
Workman

Versus

Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Hisar Division Hisar through General Manager.

.....Respondent/Management

AWARD

Passed On:-12.03.2024

1. The workman Bedo Devi @ Vedo Devi has directly filed this claim petition under Section 2-A of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947(hereinafter called the Act) for reinstatement with full back wages.
2. Today i.e. 12.03.2024 the case was fixed for filing evidence of workman but none is responding on behalf of workman. On scrutiny of the order sheets, it is revealed that the workman is not appearing/representing on 24.11.2022, 25.01.2023, 17.07.2023, 03.10.2023, 24.11.2023 and today also i.e. 12.03.2024, whereas several dates have been fixed by the Tribunal, which denotes that workman is neither serious nor interested in disposal of the case on merit.
3. Since the workman has neither put her appearance for long nor she has led any evidence to prove her cause against the management, as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference for the non-prosecution of workman.
4. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17(1) of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 755.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 ;1947 का 14ख की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **एस.ई.सी.एल** के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजको और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण—सह—श्रम न्यायालय, **जबलपुर** के पंचाट (एलसी/आर/38/2019) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18/04/2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/179/2018 -आईआर (सीएम -II)]

मणिकंदन एन., उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 755.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**LC/R/38/2019**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **S.E.C.L.** and their workmen, received by the Central Government on **18/04/2024**.

[No. L-22012/179/2018-IR (CM-II)]

MANIKANDAN N. , Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/38/2019

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

Lingraj Nayak

Area Secretary,

Sanyukt Kolya Majdoor Sangh (AITUC)

G.M. Complex, Chirmiri, Korea (C.G.)

Workman

Versus

General Manager
SECL, Chirmiri Area
Distt.- Korea (C.G.)

Management

(JUDGEMENT)

(Passed on this 3rd day of April 2024)

As per letter dated 13/02/2019 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-22012/179/2018 IR(CM-II) dt. 13/02/2019. The dispute under reference relates to:

“Whether the action on the part of the management of NCPH, Sub-Area of SECL, Chirmiri Area on dismissing Shri Anam S/o. Deena, Ex- Pump Operator, Category-II, on the same day of retirement from service i.e. on 30.04.2018 vide office order no.- SECL/NCPH/821, Dt. 30.04.2018 without conducting full fledged departmental enquiry and without following the principles of natural justice in the particular case on impersonation ground espoused by Shri Lingraj Nayak, Area Secretary of Sanyukt Koyla Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC) of Chirmiri Area is appropriate and justified ? if not, what relief Shri Anam S/o. Deena is entitled to ?”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties and were served. The workman side never appeared and did not file any Statement of Claim.

The management of SECL filed their written statement of defense, wherein they stated that while in service, a complaint was received from Satya Poojan Mishra that the workman Anam had availed the services by providing false documents. This complaint was forwarded Area General Manager vide Headquarter letter dated 10.04.2016. The Sub-Area Manager sent a letter dated 12.06.2017 to the District Magistrate Ganjam, Odisha to confirm the identity of photograph of the workman affixed on the said letter. The Superintendent, vide his letter dated 28.07.2017 inform that the photograph affixed is of Anam Panigrahi S/o. Narayan Panigrahi, R/o. Village Nandika, P.S. Purushottampur, Distt.- Ganjam and not of Anam S/o. Deena. Management issued a charge sheet dated 10.04.2018 to the workman he submitted his reply on 12.04.2018 denying the charges. Management decided to conduct a departmental enquiry into the charges and vide order dated 14.04.2018 Enquiry Officer and management representative were appointed. The enquiry was conducted in three sitting. The workman was defended by Co-worker, he participated in the enquiry and cross examined management witnesses. The Enquiry Officer submitted his enquiry report dated 23.04.2018 holding the charges proved. The Disciplinary Authority, after considering the representation of the workman on the enquiry report passed the punishment of his dismissal from 30.04.2018, which was the date of the retirement of the workman. According to management, the workman completed his service till the date of his retirement, there was no illegality during the enquiry and the charges were proved from evidence, also that the punishment is also not disproportionate to the charges. Accordingly, management has requested that the reference be answered against the workman.

The workman did not file any evidence oral or documentary or affidavit.

Management filed photocopy enquiry papers and affidavit of its witness as his examination in chief. Workman did not appear to cross examine this witness.

None appeared for workman at the stage of argument, hence argument of learned Counsel for management were heard by me. I have gone through the records as well.

The initial burden to prove his case is on workman. Since he never appeared and did not file any statement of claim or documentary as well other evidence, he is held to have failed in discharging his this burden.

On the other hand, from the uncross examined affidavit of management witness and the enquiry papers, it comes out that the workman has participated in the enquiry and punishment order has been passed after considering his representation on the enquiry report, hence there is nothing on record to hold the departmental enquiry against law. From perusal of the evidence collected during the enquiry the finding of the Enquiry Officer also cannot be faulted in law or fact, hence the finding of the Enquiry Officer are affirmed. As regards the proportionality of punishment, since the proved charge is of impersonation, the punishment of dismissal is also held not excessive.

In the light of above discussion and findings, the reference deserves to be answered against the workman and is answered accordingly. No order as to cost.

DATE:- 03/04/2024

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 756.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 ;1947 का 14ख की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **एस.ई.सी.एल** के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण—सह—श्रम न्यायालय, **जबलपुर** के पंचाट (एलसी/आर/75/2013) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18/04/2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/4/2013 -आईआर (सीएम-II)]

मणिकंदन एन., उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 756.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**LC/R/75/2013**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **S.E.C.L.** and their workmen, received by the Central Government on **18/04/2024**.

[No. L-22012/4/2013-IR (CM-II)]

MANIKANDAN N. , Dy. Director

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR****NO. CGIT/LC/R/75/2013****Present: P.K.Srivastava****H.J.S..(Retd)****The Secretary,****Bhartiya Khadan Mazdoor Sangh,****Hasdec region,****Annuppur (MP)****Workman****Versus****The Sub Regional Manager,****Behrabandh sub area,****South Eastern Coalfields Limited,****Annuppur (MP)****Management****AWARD****(Passed on this 19Th day of February-2024.)**

As per letter dated 23/05/2013 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number L-22012/4/2013 (IR(CM-II)) dt. 23/05/2013 . The dispute under reference related to :-

“क्या उप क्षेत्रीय प्रबंधक बहेराबांध उपक्षेत्रीय साउथ ईस्टर्न कोल फील्ड्स द्वारा कर्मकार श्री शिव कुमार केवट इलेक्ट्रीशियन की जन्म तिथि का सुधार नहीं किया जाना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार क्या अनुतोष पाने का अधिकारी है?”

After registering a case on the basis of reference received, notices were issued to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statements of claim and defence.

Case of the Workman in brief, as put up in his statement of claim, is mainly that he was initially appointed on 27/04/1984 on the post of technician. In his service record, his date of birth was wrongly mentioned as 07/01/1960, whereas his correct date of birth, as shown in his class VIII Mark sheet issued by the Government Intermediate School District Shahdol was January 7, 1964. He had cleared his class Xth examination from Government Higher Secondary School Bijuri District Shahdol, wherein his date of birth was mentioned as January 7, 1964. This date of birth (7/01/1964) was also mentioned in his service book, filled on September 3rd, 1984. It was due to mistake on the management that his incorrect the date of birth that is January 7th, 1960 was recorded in form B. The Workman requested the management to correct his date of birth and record his correct date of birth. The management did not grant this relief to the workmen hence he raised a dispute. After failure of conciliation, the reference was made to this tribunal for adjudication. The Workman has accordingly prayed that his date of birth be corrected in his service records and he be granted all the benefits during service and post retirement, treating his date of birth as January 7th, 1964.

The case of management, as taken in their written statement of defence is that his date of birth January 7th, 1960 was recorded by management in his form B and other service records on the basis of information provided by the Workman himself. The management also stated that the Workman did not file any document regarding date of his birth and also that on medical examination also his date of birth was ascertained as January 7th, 1960.

In evidence, the workman filed and proved documents Ex W1 photocopy of class 8th Mark sheet, ExW2, I School Mark sheet ExW3 form B, ExW4 medical examination form of the workmen dated December 21, 1983, ExW5 letter of management sent to the assistant Labour Commissioner during conciliation proceedings stating that the Workman had not produced any document relating to his date of birth at the time of his joining and at the time of his medical examination. The management has filed documents Ex M1, medical examination form dated December 21, 1983, ExM2 form B, ExM3 form PS-3, ExM4 service record extract. Workman has filed his affidavit as his examination in Chief. He has been cross-examined by management. Management has also examined his witnesses by way of filing his affidavit as his examination in Chief. This witness has not been cross-examined by Workman.

At the time of **argument**, none appeared from the side of Workman. Hence I have heard the argument of Mr Anup Nayar. Learned counsel for management and have gone through the record. No written arguments have been filed by any of the parties.

Learned counsel for management has relied on following decisions-

1-Bharat Coking Coal Ltd and others Vs Shyam Kishore Singh (2020)3SCC411.

2-Judgement of Hon.ble High Court of MP dated 13/04/2018, passed by Single Bench in WP No. 19334/2013 in Prabhat Kumar Dwiwedi vs Union of India and others

The main crux of argument of Learned Counsel for management is that the workman never filed his documents regarding his date of birth at any point of time and secondly, he raising this dispute at the far end of his career hence his claim is barred by delay and laches

The reference itself the issue for determination in this case.

It is not disputed between the parties that the Workman, first joined as an electrician on April 27th, 1984. Ex W1 & W2 are the Mark sheet of class 8th and 10th which have been proved show that he cleared these examinations in the year 1978 and 1980 that is to say, before he joined with the management. The workman has filed photocopy of his service extract, admitted by management marked Ex W6. This document has been maintained by the management. In this document, his date of birth is mentioned as January 7th, 1964. His qualification matriculation has also been mentioned in this document. This document has been prepared on August 16th, 1987. That is to say, after three years of his joining the service. In his form B, claimed to be prepared by management on the basis of information furnished by the Workman, his date of birth is mentioned as January 7th, 1960. There is an endorsement dated February 2nd, 2016 signed by the Assistant Manager (PR) Baherabund Sub Area, which is as follows-

“As per letter number 970 dated 28/30.03.15 & 1067 dated 21/29.09.2015 DoB of Sri Shiv kumar s/o Jamuna has been finalised by competent authority as 21.12.1960.(as per IME report).”

The medical examination form of the workman Ex W shows that as stated by him, and as per appearance, his age was 23 years. This medical examination form has been signed and prepared by the doctor examining the Workman on December 21st, 1983. After his examination, the doctor has remarked that the Workman is fit for duty. This is the medical examination conducted on the workman before his joining with the management on April 27th, 1984. Judicial notice of the fact can be taken that the form B is prepared by the management on the basis of information provided by the Workman. As has been mentioned earlier, in this form, his date of birth is mentioned as January 7th, 1960 with the endorsement as has been mentioned earlier in this judgement. The service records, extract

of which has been filed by the Workman and has been admitted by management, and referred to earlier, is also prepared by management. Thus, it comes out that there are two dates of birth of the applicant Workman recorded in the records of the management. In other words, it could be said that there was a discrepancy in the records maintained by management with respect to the date of birth of the workmen.

The Implementation Instructions 76(in short I.I.76), prepared under National Coal Wage Agreement (NCWA) provide a procedure to deal with discrepancies with regard to age or date of birth of the workmen. The relevant paragraph is mentioned as follows –

IMPLEMENTATION INSTRUCTION NO. 76

PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINATION/ VERIFICATION OF AGE OF EMPLOYEES

(A) Determination of the age at the time of appointment

i) Matriculates.

In the case of appointees who have passed Matriculation or equivalent examinations, the date of birth recorded in the said certificate shall be treated as correct date of birth and the same will not be altered under any circumstances.

ii) Non-matriculates but educated

In the case of appointees who have pursued studies in a recognised educational institution, the date of birth recorded in the School Leaving Certificate, shall be treated as correct date of birth and the same will not be altered under any circumstances.

(B) Review determination of date of birth in respect of existing employees.

i) a) In the case of the existing employees Matriculation Certificate or Higher Secondary Certificate issued by the recognised Universities or Board or Middle Pass Certificate issued by the Board of Education and/or Department of Public Instruction and admit cards issued by the aforesaid Bodies should be treated as correct provided they were issued by the said Universities/Boards/Institutions prior to the date of employment.

It has also been mentioned that in the extract of service records of the workman, referred to above, his qualification matriculation has been recorded. As has been referred in the I.I. 76, in case of any discrepancy regarding the age or date of birth of Workman, who is matriculate, his date of birth mentioned in his matriculation certificate shall be final. The management has taken another route of going through medical examination in determining the age or date of birth of the workman by ignoring his date of birth mentioned in his matriculation certificate cannot be held to be justified in law in doing so. The main contention of the management has been that the Workman never produced his any certificate, including his matriculation certificate with respect to his date of birth is not worth reliance because if it was so, how come his date of birth as mentioned in his matriculation certificate was mentioned in his service extract prepared by management itself and secondly, his case on this point is corroborated by his this statement on oath.

Hence, in the light of above discussion, the action of management in not correct in the date of birth of the workman Shivkumar as shown in his matriculation certificate is against the Implementation Instructions 76 and is held against law.

As regards to the second leg of argument from the side of management regarding delay and latches on the part of the applicant Workman in getting corrected his date of birth, facts in the case of **Bhatart Coking Coal (Supra)** are indistinguishable from the facts of the case in hand. In the referred case, the workman raised dispute regarding his date of birth in the year 2009 when he was about to retire in March 2010. His representation was rejected and he filed a writ against the rejection order after four years of his retirement. In the case in hand, some documents maintained by management itself contained the date of birth of the workmen, which was correct. according to and in some documents, maintained by management itself, his date of birth was incorrect. according to him. Hence, he did not have a case on to raise the dispute at an earlier stage.

With regard to the second case of Prabhat Chandra (Supra), referred to by the learned counsel for management. The writ petition filed by the Workman for correction of his date of birth was found barred by delay and latches on the basis of facts peculiar to the case.

Hence, in the light of above discussion, I am of the considered view that the referred cases, being distinguishable on facts, do not help the learned counsel for management.

On the basis of above discussion and findings, the action of management in not correcting the date of birth of the workman Shivkumar electrician according to his matriculation certificate is held against law. Consequently,

the workman is a held entitled to continue in service, treating his date of birth January 7th 1964 and is also held entitled to in service and post retirement benefits accordingly. The reference deserves to be answered accordingly.

AWARD

The action of management in not correcting the date of birth of the workman Shiv Kumar Kewat electrician according to his Matriculation Certificate is held against law. Consequently, the workman is a held entitled to continue in service, treating his date of birth January 7th, 1964 till date of his superannuation to be decided as per rules, treating his date of birth January 7th, 1964 and is also held entitled to in service and post retirement benefits accordingly. The workman is further held entitled to litigation cost contributed at Rs. 10,000/-payable to the Workman within 30 days from the date of publication of award in official Gazette, failing which interest at the rate of 6% per annum from the date of award till payment.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

DATE: 19/02/2024

नई दिल्ली, 19 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 757.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यू.सी.एल के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण—सह-श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. एलसी/आर/52/2014) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18/04/2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/36/2014—आई.आर. (सीएम-II)]

मणिकंदन एन., उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 19th April, 2024

S.O. 757.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (**Ref. No. LC/R/52/2014**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the Management of **W.C.L.** and their workmen, received by the Central Government on **18/04/2024**.

[No. L-22012/36/2014 – IR (CM-II)]

MANIKANDAN N. , Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/52/2014

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

Shri Ramdas

S/o Sh. Jettoo,

Ex-Chowkidar, Type-A, Gude,

PO : Paulachouri,

Tehsil- Junardey, Chhindwara

. Workman

Versus

The Manager,

Mohan Colliery,

M/s. Western Coalfields Limited,

Kanhan Area, PO: Ambara,

Chhindwara,

...Management

AWARD**(Passed on this 29th day of February 2024.)**

As per letter dated 19/06/2014 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-22012/36/2014-IR(CM-II) dt. 19/06/2014. The dispute under reference relates to:

“क्या प्रबंधक, मोहन कॉलनी वेस्टर्न कालफील्डस लिमिटेड कान्हान क्षेत्र जिला छिंदवाडा द्वारा आवेदक श्री रामदास पिता जेठू पूर्व चौकीदार, को उनकी सेवामें भर्ती के समय प्राथमिक रिकार्ड फार्म बी में अर्ज जन्म तिथि 13.06.1954 को राष्ट्रीय कोल वेतन समझौता के प्रावधानों के अनुसार आयु निर्धारण समिति द्वारा संशोधित कर 17.01.1952 करना व संशोधित जन्म तिथि 17.01.1952 के आधार पर सेवानिवृत्त किया जाना न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार क्या अनुतोष पाने का अधिकारी है?”

After registering the case on the basis of reference, notices were issued to the parties and were duly served on them.

The case of the workman in brief is that his real date of birth is 13/06/1954 which was wrongly recorded in his service records by management as 17/01/1954 and he was wrongly superannuated on 31/01/2012 on the basis of his wrong date of birth. The workman did file many representations before the management with copy of his educational qualification in which his correct date of birth was mentioned but the management did not grant him any relief regarding correction of his date of birth. The workman has therefore prayed that holding his retirement on 31/01/2012 bad in law he deemed to be in service till 13/06/2014 on the basis of his correct date of birth and also they held entitled to all service benefits accordingly.

The case of management is mainly that in all his service records the date of birth of the workman was recorded as 17/01/1952 on information given by him during his service tenure, a general notice was displayed and was communicated to all the workman including the applicant workman in the year 1981 in which the date of birth recorded in the service record of all the workman and they were asked to raise objection within 90 days if they felt that their date of birth was wrongly recorded in the year 1987 also the same exercise was done the workman raised dispute regarding his date of birth at latter stage his case was referred to age determination community constituted under II 76 he did not produce any satisfactory evidence hence his date of birth was not changed. Accordingly, the management has prayed that the reference be answered against the workman.

In evidence, the workman did not appear he only filed photocopy of his service extract admitted by management he did not lead any other evidence.

Management filed affidavit of his witnesses who corroborated the case of management and proved his service records form V service extract, form PS-3 and PS-4 and two general notices. This witness is on cross examined by workman.

The workman was not present at the time of argument hence argument for Learned Counsel for management have been heard by me, I have also gone through the record.

The reference itself is the issue for determination.

The initial burden to prove his claim is on the workman in absence of any evidence on his behalf, he is held having not proved his claim on the other hand, management has proved its case by uncrossed examined affidavit of its witnesses and document as mentioned.

On the basis of above discussion holding the claim of the workman not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against him and is answered as follows: -

The action of management superannuating the workman Ramdas on the basis of his date of birth 17/11/1952 is held justified in law the workman is held entitled to no relief.

AWARD

In the light of this factual backdrop, The action of management superannuating the workman Ramdas on the basis of his date of birth 17/11/1952 is held justified in law the workman is held entitled to no relief.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 758.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरपोर्ट अथॉरिटी ऑफ़ इंडिया; शक्ति आनंद सिक्योरिटी एजेंसी; 4926, संदीप मित्तल सिक्योरिटी एजेंसी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और रिफरेन्स न.-164/2021 श्री रोहित नेगी; रिफरेन्स न.- 212/2021 श्री सरोज कुमार तिवारी द्वारा-इंडियन नेशनल माइग्रेंट वर्कर्स यूनियन के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 164, 212/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.जेड-16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-31]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 758.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 164, 212/2021) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Airport Authority of India; Shakti Anand Security Agency; 4926, Sandeep Mittal Security Agency and Reference No. 164/2021 Shri Rohit Negi and Reference No. 212/2021 Shri Saroj Kumar Tiwari through-Indian National Migrant Workers Union which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-31]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL CUM – LABOUR COURT NO II, NEW DELHI

ID.No. 164/2021

Sh. Rohit Negi, S/o Sh. Madan Singh Negi,
R/o R.G-46, Pocket-A, Raghuvir Nagar, Tagore Garden,
S.O. West Delhi-110027.

Through-Indian National Migrant Worker's Union,
1170/8, 3rd Floor Govind Puri Extn. Main Road, Kalkaji,
New Delhi-110019

ID.No. 212/2021

Sh. Saroj Kumar Tiwari, S/o Sh. Kedar Tiwari,
R/o 125-C, Colony Gali No. 04, Sangam Vihar,
Pushpa Bhawan, Delhi-110062.

Through-Indian National Migrant Worker's Union,
1170/8, 3rd Floor Govind Puri Extn. Main Road, Kalkaji,
New Delhi-110019

VERSUS

1. **Airport Authority of India,**
Rajiv Gandhi Bhawan, Safdargunj Airport, New Delhi-110003.
2. **Shakti Anand Security Agency,**
S-II, 2nd Floor, Chamber-04, Plot No. 07,
LSC Sector-12, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.
3. **4926, Sandeep Mittal Security Agency,**
01,281/1, Main Palam Vihar Road, Brijwasan,
New Delhi-110061.

AWARD

These are the two cases filed by the workmen U/S 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act (here in after referred as an Act). Workmen in their claim statement have stated that on 01.07.2017 as well as on 01.04.2017 they were posted as Security Guard with the management at the last drawn salary of Rs. 24,152/- per month. Management i.e. Airport Authority of India has no license for keeping the contract labour. Management- 1, 2 & 3 have not been providing any legal facilities. When they demanded the same, management got annoyed and had terminated their services in violation of labour law on 01.10.2019. Before terminating their services management had obtained their signatures on blank papers. Both the workmen had sent the demand letter, but management has not given reply to take them on duty. They have approached to the conciliation officer but no result have been yielded. Hence they filed the claim.

Management-1 had appeared and denied relationship of employer and employee between workmen and him. Hence, he submitted the claim against him is liable to be dismissed. Management- 2 & 3 have not filed authority letter and they were proceeded exparte vide order dated 24.05.2022. Rejoinder have been filed. Issues have been framed vide order dated 06.12.2022.

Thereafter, claimants were asked to examine the witnesses to substantiate their claims, however, proxy for claimants who have appeared on 24.01.2024 had stated before this tribunal that they have no contact with the workmen. In these circumstances, when the workmen are not interested in pursuing their claims, their claims stand dismissed. Award is accordingly passed. A copy of this award is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the ID act 1947. File is consigned to record room.

Date: 24.01.2024

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 759.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **बर्ड वर्ल्डवाइड फ्लाइट सर्विसेज इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड** के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और **श्री संतोष कुमार** के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 207/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड -16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-39]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 759.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 207/2021**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Bird Worldwide Flight Services India Private Limited** and **Shri Santosh Kumar** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-39]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOV. INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL
CUM – LABOUR COURT NO II, NEW DELHI**

I.D. No. 207/2021

Sh. Santosh Kumar , S/o Sh. Ramesh Chand,

R/o —Nangla Khuba, Post- Mehagora, District- Aligarh,

Uttar Pradesh-202155.

VERSUS**The Managing Director,****Bird Worldwide Flight Services India Pvt. Ltd.**

E-9, Connaught House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001.

Also At:- Bird Worldwide Flight Services India Pvt. Ltd.

IGI Airport, Terminal-3, New Delhi- 110037.

AWARD

This is an application under section 2A of Industrial dispute act filed by the claimant with the prayer that his termination from the service by the management is declared unjust and he be reinstated in service with full back wages.

Notice of this petition was issued to the management. Management had appeared and filed the written statement denying the claim of the workman. Issues were framed vide order dated 12-10-2022. During the course of proceeding, workmen wishes to withdraw the claim of jurisdiction. His statement is recorded separately.

In view of the above statement of record, His claim is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Award is passed accordingly. A copy the award is hereby sent to the appropriate government for notification under section 17 of the I.D. Act 1947.

Date:11/01/2024

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 760.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार अम्बुजा सीमेंट लिमिटेड (रूड़की यूनिट) के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और अम्बुजा सीमेंट एम्प्लाइज यूनियन के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 139/2020) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. Z -16025/04/2024- IR(M)-42]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 760.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 139/2020**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Ambuja Cement Limited (Roorkee Unit)** and **Ambuja Cement Employees Union** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-42]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL
CUM – LABOUR COURT NO II, NEW DELHI****ID.No. 139/2020****The President,****Ambuja Cement Employees Union,**

Village – Lakeshwari, Post- Sikanderpur,

Tehsil – Bhagwanpur, District – Haridwar,

Uttarakhand- 247661.

VERSUS

The Unit Head
Ambuja Cement Ltd. (Roorkee Unit),
 Village – Lakeshwari, Post- Sikanderpur Bahiswal,
 Tehsil- Roorkee, District- Haridwar,
 Uttarakhand- 247661.

ORDER

The appropriate Government Sh. **A.K. Singh**, Government of India, Ministry of Labour/ Shram Mantralya has sent the reference refer dated 02.09.2020 to this tribunal for adjudication in the following words:

“Whether the action of management in suspending as well as terminating the workman the President, Ambuja Cement Employees Union, Haridwar is taken in undue haste, without application of mind and without affording natural justice? If so, what remedy should be provided to the workman now?”

After receiving the said reference, The appropriate Government Sh. **Navin Vaidya, Deputy Director**, Government of India, Ministry of Labour/ Shram Mantralya has sent the corrigendum dated 14.12.2020. The reference be read as:

1. *“Whether Sh. Sumit Chakarvarthy and Sh. Dipak Sharma are the workmen as per the provision of I.D Act, 1947?”*
2. *Whether the action of Management of M/s Ambuja Cement suspending as well as terminating the Sh. Sumit Chakarvarthy and Dipak Sharma is taken in due haste by the management without conducting the proper inquiry proceedings?*
If, so, what remedy should be provided to the Sh. Sumit Chakarvarty and Sh. Dipak Kumar Sharma now?”

Notice were issued to both the parties. AR for the management Sh. **Kamalkant Tyagi** has appeared and filed the W.S denying the averment made in the claim. The claimants have not been appearing since long before this tribunal, despite, providing a number of opportunities.

In these circumstances, when the workmen are not interested in pursuing their claim. This tribunal has no option except to pass the no disputant award. Hence, no disputant award is passed. Award is passed accordingly File is consigned to the record room. A copy of this award is hereby sent to the appropriate government for notification under section 17 of the I.D Act 1947.

Date: 19.03.2024

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 761.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स बर्ड वर्ल्डवाइड फ्लाइट सर्विसेज इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री चंचल कुमार के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 51/2017) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-38]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 761.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 51/2017**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Bird Worldwide Flight Services India Pvt. Ltd.** and **Mr. Chanchal Kumar** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-38]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL
CUM – LABOUR COURT NO II, NEW DELHI**

I.D. 51/2017

Sh.Chanchal kumar S/O Shri Bishamber Singh
H.No. B- 117, Street No. 8 Mata Wali Gali,
Johripur Gokul Puri
East Delhi
Delhi-94

VERSUS

**The Management of
M/S Bird worldwide Flight
Services India Pvt. Ltd.**
E-9, Connaught House
Connaught Place
New Delhi-110001

AWARD

Sh. Niranjana Kumar, Assistant Labour Commissioner has sent the reference Dated 15.09.2017 to this Tribunal for Adjudication in the following word-

“Whether the action of the management of Bird Worldwide Flight Services Private Limited (BWFS) in denying the wages for the period of 30/07/2017 to 19/03/2017 when the workman was not taken on duty though he was available for duty and was willing to do the duty in illegal and/or unjustified. If so, what benefit is the workman entitled to and what directions are necessary in this respect?”

Upon receiving of this reference, Notices were issued, both the workman and management to appear before this tribunal. Both workman and management filed their claims and reply. Evidence were laid by the workman. Management was also asked to examine its witness. Management had examined the witness. Matter is listed for argument. During the course of argument, this tribunal has asked the claimant, how this tribunal has jurisdiction over the worker of the private ltd. company.

Before proceeding further, It is necessary to cull out the provision regarding the jurisdiction.

Counsel for the claimants has stated that he has appeared before this tribunal because the notices were sent by this tribunal and upon considering the plea assistant labour commissioner shri Niranjana has sent the reference to this court for adjudication.

As per section 2(a) Appropriate Government means the Central Government in relation to any industrial dispute which pertain to any industry carried on by all under the authority of central government.

Section-2(a)(1) of the Act give the detail expression of covering the industry which falls under the definition of central government controlled industry. It is reproduced as under.

‘in relation to any industrial dispute concerning any industry carried on by or under the authority of the Central Government, or by a railway company [or concerning any such controlled industry as may be specified in this behalf by the Central Government] or in relation to an industrial dispute concerning [a Dock Labor Board established under Section 5A of the Dock workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), or [the Industrial Finance Corporation of India Limited formed and registered under the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956)] or the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), or the Board of Trustees constituted under section 3A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948), or the Central Board of Trustees and the State Boards of Trustees constituted under section 5A and section 5B, respectively, of the Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), or the Life Insurance Corporation of India established under section 3 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956), or [the Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Limited registered under the companies Act, 1956 (1 of 1956)], or the Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation established under section 3 of the Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation Act, 1961 (47 of 1961), or the Central Warehousing Corporation established under section 3 of the Warehousing Corporations Act, 1962 (58 of 1962), or the Unit Trust of India established under section 3 of the Unit Trust of India Act, 1963 (52

of 1963), or the Food Corporations of India established under section 3, or a Board of Management established for two or more contiguous States under section 16, of the Food Corporation Act, 1964 (37 of 1964), or [the Airports Authority of India constituted under section 3 of the Airports Authority of India Act, 1994 (55 of 1994), or a Regional Rural banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), or the Export Credit and Guarantee Corporation Limited or the Industrial Reconstruction Bank of India Limited], [the National Housing Bank established under section 3 of the National Housing Bank Act, 1987 (53 of 1987)], or [[an air transport service, or a banking or an insurance company,] a mine, an oil field,] [a cantonment Board,] or a [major port, any company in which not less than fifty-one percent of the paid-up share capital is held by the Central Government, or any corporation, not being a corporation referred to in this clause, established by or under any law made by parliament, or the Central public sector undertaking, subsidiary companies set up by the principal undertaking and autonomous bodies owned or controlled by the Central Government, the Central Government, and]

Ld. AR of the workman is unable to tell how this tribunal has the jurisdiction to try their claim particularly when the appropriate government is not the central government in respect of the respondent herein. Ld. AR has only stated that the Sh. Niranjan Kumar, Assistant Labour Commissioner had sent the reference to this tribunal for adjudication.

Here the respondent has not come within the definition of the Central Government. Mere exercising the unjust power by any Authority entertaining the application which does not pertain in a jurisdiction does not justify the wrong. Therefore, the argument that Shri Niranjan Kumar, Assistant Labour Commissioner had sent the reference to this Tribunal is not tenable.

In these circumstances, this tribunal has found that it has no jurisdiction to try the claim of the workmen. Hence, the claim of the workmen stand dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Award is accordingly passed. A copy of this award is sent to appropriate government for notification under section 17 of the I.D. Act. A copy of this award is also sent to the Central Labour Commissioner for information and action.

Date: 01.03.2024

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 762.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिफरेन्स न.- 92/2020 श्री तेज सिंह गुर्जर, रिफरेन्स न.-56/2020 श्री अमन द्वारा-इंडियन स्टील एंड मेटल वर्कर्स यूनियन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और कंटेनर कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड; सैम सर्वेयर्स एंड अड्जस्टर्स के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 56, 92/2020) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-40]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 762.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 56, 92/2020) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Reference No. 92/2020 Shri Tej Singh Gurjar and Reference No. 56/2020 Shri Aman through-Indian Steel & Metal Workers Union and Container Corporation of India Limited; Sam Surveyors and Adjusters** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-40]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO-II, NEW DELHI****I.D. No. 92/2020**

Sh. Tej Singh Gurjar, S/o Sh. Bhola Ram Gurjar,
R/o- Gazipur, Kanjoli, Karauli, Todabhim, Rajasthan.

I.D. No. 56/2020

Sh. Aman, S/o Sh. Sone Lal Shah,
R/o House No-262/19, Shiv Enclave Ismailpur,
Amar Nagar, Faridabad, Haryana-121003.

Through- Indian Stell & Metal Workers Union,
1770/8, 3rd Floor, Govind Puri Exten. Main Road Kalkaji,
New Delhi-110019.

VERSUS

- 1. The Chief Manager,**
Container Corporation of India Ltd.
Inland Container Depot, Tughlakabad, New Delhi-110020.
- 2. Sam Surveyors & Adjusters,**
53, Venkatachlam Steert, Royapuram,
Chennai-600013.

AWARD

By this composite order, I shall dispose of these two applications of U/S 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act (here in after referred as an Act) filed by the different claimants against the same respondents, because of having the common respondents and same cause of action, these cases are taken together for their illegal termination. Claims of the workmen are that they have been serving the management-1 through management-2 at the post of surveyors at the last drawn salary of Rs. 14,676 and Rs. 14,700 per month. Management-2 is the false contractor created by management-1 in violation of contract labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act 1970. Workmen service records are clean and they have not given any complaint so far. During the services, management had obtained their signature on blank papers and have not been providing any legal facilities i.e. appointment letter, Leave Book, bonus, overtime, weekly and events holidays etc. Management got annoyed with the demands raised by the claimants had thrown them out from the service of the management on 01.06.2018 and 12.09.2019. They had tried to take back their services but failed. They had sent the complaint to the labour commissioner, but, it has yielded no result. Hence, They have filed the present claims.

W.S has been filed by the respondent-1, and he denied the relationship of employer and employee between the claimants and management-1. He has submitted that claims are liable to be dismissed. Respondent-2 has also denied the averment made in the claims. Workman AR submits that he has no contract with the claimants since long.

Today, the AR of the workman submits that he has no contact with the workmen since long.

In these circumstances, when the claimants have not been appearing since long, it appears that they are not interested to pursue their cases. Hence, their claims have been resulted into no disputant award. No disputant awards are accordingly passed. A copy of this award is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the ID act 1947. File is consigned to record room. A copy of this award is placed in each of the file.

Date 14th March, 2024

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 763.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली इंटरनेशनल एयरपोर्ट प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; निंबस हारबर फैसिलिटी मैनेजमेंट प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; टेनों फैसिलिटी मैनेजमेंट इंडिया प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; सी.एल.आर. फैसिलिटी सर्विसेज प्राइवेट लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री प्रमोद कुमार एंड 127 अन्य के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 52/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/03/2024- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 763.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 52/2021) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **Delhi International Airport Private Limited; Nimbus Harbor Facility Management Pvt Ltd; Tenon Facility Management India Private Limited; C.L.R. Facility Services Private Limited and Shri Pramod Kumar and 127 others** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/03/2024-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL
-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO II, NEW DELHI**

I.D. No.52/2021

Sh. Pramod Kumar & 127 Others,

Through - Hindustan Engineering & General Mazdoor Union,

Head Office: D-2/24, Sultanpuri, Delhi-110086.

Branch Office: A-193, Karampura, New Delhi-110015.

VERSUS

1. Delhi International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,

New UdaanBhawan, Opp. Terminal-3, IGI Airport,

New Delhi-110037.

2. Nimbus Harbour Facility Management Pvt. Ltd.,

E-305, Sushant Shopping Arcade, SushantLok -01,

Gurgaon-122009.

3. Tenon Facility Management India Pvt. Ltd.,

Plot No.13, Sector -18, Electric Gurgaon Haryana,

4. C.L.R.Facility Services Pvt. Ltd.

Ansai Part -01, B-219, 2nd Floor, BhikajiCama Place,

BhikajiCama Place, New Delhi-110066.

AWARD

This is an application of 33A of the I.D Act filed by one hundred twenty-eight workmen stating that their services have been terminated by management-1 & 2, while their case for regularization has been pending before this tribunal. It is further their case that management-1 & 2 had stated after calling them on duty on 01.03.2021 their services would be terminated with affect of 31.03.2021 because both management had decided that they will take the worker through contractor. As such they had made prayer that their termination of services as declared illegal and they will be reinstated with job till the pendency of their dispute.

Respondent-1 denied each and every fact mentioned in the claim statement. He submitted that management is not necessary party to the alleged dispute filed by the claimant. There is no privity of contract between the management/respondent and the workman. Government of India introduced the policy for privatization of the airports operated and running by AAI consequent upon the same, respondent/management also participated in the process and on the basis of which its bid was sold. Pursuing to the above mentioned facts, an agreement known as operation management and development agreement was entered between the AAI and the respondent on 04.04.2006. Respondent has assigned the contract work to the respondent 2, 3 & 4 respectively. Respondent-2, 3 & 4 have not appeared and they were proceeded ex-parte vide order dated 31.10.2022. On the day issues have been framed. Claimants were asked to examine the witness. However, inspite of providing three opportunities nobody appeared on behalf of claimant to substantiate their claim. It means that claimant are not interested to pursuing their claim. Hence, their claim is resulted into failure.

In these circumstances, claims of the claimants stand dismissed. Award is passed accordingly. File is consigned to the record room. A copy of this award is hereby sent to the appropriate government for notification under section 17 of the I.D Act 1947.

Dated: 04.12.2023

ATUL KUMAR GARG, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 764.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिफरेन्स न.- 73/2020 श्री ओमपाल सिंह, रिफरेन्स न.-74/2020 श्री कन्हैया लाल, रिफरेन्स न.- 75/2020 श्री अमित श्रीवास्तव, रिफरेन्स न.-76/2020 श्री योगेश कुमार, रिफरेन्स न.-77/2020 श्री खिलानी सिंह, रिफरेन्स न.-256/2021 नववेश कुमार द्वारा-इंडियन स्टील एंड मेटल वर्कर्स यूनियन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और कंटेनर कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड; मेटकॉफे एंड होडकिन्सॉन प्राइवेट लिमिटेड; सैम सर्वेयर्स एंड अड्जस्टर्स के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-2, नई दिल्ली, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 73, 74, 75, 76, 77/2020 and 256/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड -16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-41]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 764.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 73, 74, 75, 76, 77/2020 and 256/2021) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-2, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Reference No. 73/2020 Shri Ompal Singh Gautam, Reference No. 74/2020 Shri Kanheya Lal Reference No. 75/2020 Shri Amit Srivastava, Reference No. 76/2020 Shri Yoghsh Kumar, Reference No. 77/2020 Shri Khilani Singh and Reference No. 256/2021 Shri Navlesh Kumar through-Indian Stell & Metal Workers Union and Container Corporation of India Limited; Metcalfe & Hodgkinson Pty Ltd; Sam Surveyors and Adjusters which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-41]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ATUL KUMAR GARG, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO-II, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 73/2020

Sh. Ompal Singh Gautam, S/o Sh. Bhikkan Singh,

R/o House No-335, Block-D, Pul Pehladpur, New Delhi-110044.

I.D. No. 74/2020

Sh. Kanheya Lal, S/o Sh. Parmanand,

R/o House No. D-447, Pul Pehladpur,

Badarpur, New Delhi-110044.

I.D. No. 75/2020

Sh. Amit Srivastava, S/o Sh. Nand Kumar Srivastava,

R/o House No. B-95, Jaitpur Extn. New Delhi-110044.

I.D. No. 76/2020

Sh. Yogesh Kumar, S/o Sh. Puran Chand,

R/o House No. HR-228 B/6, Pul Pehladpur,

Jaitpur, New Delhi-110044.

I.D. No. 77/2020

Sh. Khilani Singh, S/o Sh. Rohtash Singh,

R/o House No-865, Gali No.-39-B, Molar Band Extn.

South Delhi-110019.

I.D. No. 256/2021

Sh. Navlesh Kumar, S/o Sh. Basant Prasad Singh,

R/o House No.-D-447, Left Said Block-D, Pul Pahladpur,

Badarpur, South Delhi-110044.

Through- Indian Stell & Metal Workers Union,

1770/8, 3rd Floor, Govind Puri Extn. Main Road Kalkaji,

New Delhi-110019.

Versus

1. The Chief Manager,

Container Corporation of India Ltd.

Inland Container Depot, Tughlakabad, New Delhi-110020.

2. Metcalfe & Hodgkinson Pvt. Ltd.

Flat No-412-A, Mansarovar, 90, Nehru Place,

New Delhi-110019.

3. Sam Surveyors & Adjusters,

219-A, Inland Content Depot, Tughlakabad,

New Delhi-110020.

AWARD

By this composite order, I shall dispose of these six applications of U/S 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act (here in after referred as an Act) filed by the different claimants against the same respondents, because of having the

common respondents and same cause of action, these cases are taken together for their illegal termination. Name and particular of their employment are given below-

List of Workmen

Sl. No.	Name	Father's Name	Post	Dates of Joining	Dates of Termination	Last Drawn Salary
1	Khilani Singh	Rohtash Singh	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	06.09.2005	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-
2	Navlesh Kumar	Basant Prasad Singh	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	08.08.2006	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-
3	Amit Srivastava	Nand Kr. Shrivastava	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	09.09.2009	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-
4	Yogesh Kumar	Puran Chand	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	23.11.2005	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-
5	Ompal Singh Gautam	Bhikkan Singh	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	20.01.2003	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-
6	Kanheya Lal	Parmanand	Data Entry Operator/Tally Clerk	04.06.2004	01.06.2018	Rs. 17,498/-

Claims of the workmen are that they have been serving the management-1 through management-2 & 3. Management-2 & 3 are the false contractor created by management-1 in violation of contract labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act 1970. Workmen service records are clean and they have not given any complaint so far. During the services, management had obtained their signature on blank papers and have not been providing any legal facilities i.e. appointment letter, Leave Book, bonus, overtime, weekly and events holidays etc. Management got annoyed with the demands raised by the claimants had thrown them out from the service of the management. They had tried to take back their services but failed. They had sent the complaint to the labour commissioner, but, it has yielded no result. Hence, they have filed the present claims.

W.S has already been filed by the respondent-1, and he denied the relationship of employer and employee between the claimants and management-1. He has submitted that claims are liable to be dismissed. Respondent-2 & 3 have also filed the WS denying the averment made in the claim.

Today, Workman AR submits that he has no contact with the claimants since long.

In these circumstances, when the claimants have not been appearing since long, it appears that they are not interested to pursue their cases. Hence, their claims have been resulted into no disputant award. No disputant awards are accordingly passed. A copy of this award is sent to the appropriate government for notification as required under section 17 of the ID act 1947. File is consigned to record room. A copy of this award is placed in each of the file.

Dated: 14th March, 2024

ATUL KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 765.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स सतलुज विद्युत निगम लिमिटेड; मेसर्स जय प्रकाश एसोसिएट्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री महेंद्र जखमोला, जनरल मैनेजर, संविदा श्रमिक संघ के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 29/2021) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/17/2021- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 765.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 29/2021) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to M/s Sutlej Vidyut Nigam Limited; M/s Jai Prakash Associates Pvt. Ltd. and Shri Mahendra Jakhmola, General Manager, Contract Labor Union which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-29011/17/2021-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer.

ID No.29/2021

Registered on:-21.1.2022

Sh. Mahendra Jakhmola, General Secretary, Samvida Shramik Sangh, 81, New Park Road, Gandhi Gram Dehradun, Dehradun-248001.

.....Workman

Versus

1. The General Manager, M/s Satluj Vidhyut Nigam Ltd., Naitwar Mori Hydro Electric Project, Mori, Distt, Distt. Uttarkashi(Uttarakhand)-249128.
2. The General Manager, M/s Jai Prakash Associates Pvt. Ltd. Naitwar Mori Hydro Electric Project, Mori, Distt. Uttarkashi(Uttarakhand)-249128.

.....Respondents/Managements

AWARD

Passed on:-27.03.2024

Central Government vide Notification No.L-29011/17/2021-IR(M) Dated 13.12.2021, under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the claim of Samvida Shramik Sangh, Uttarakhand, that the managements of M/s Jai Prakash Associates Ltd. Naitwar Mori Hydro Electric Project, Uttarkashi and M/s Satluj Vidhyut Nigam Ltd. Naitwar Mori Hydro Electric Project, Uttarkashi did not provided Central Minimum wages, adopted unfair labour practice and demand for reinstatement of workmen Shri Baburam Dimiri, Shri Achpal Singh Rawat and Shri Parmendra Singh to service is legal, fair and justified? If yes, what relief the workmen are entitled to?

1. On the receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workmen as well as to the respondent/management. The postal article sent to the workmen, referred above, is duly delivered to the workmen. The workmen is given sufficient opportunities to file claim statement but none turned up in spite of the opportunity afforded to file claim statement, which shows that the workmen is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit. The workmen has not appeared on 18.2.2022, 3.6.2022, 16.9.2022, 3.11.2022, 5.1.2023, 1.3.2023, 6.6.2023, 20.9.2023, 30.11.2023 and today also i.e. 27.3.2024 none turned up on behalf of workmen.
2. Since the workmen has neither put his appearance nor he has filed any statement of claim to prove his cause against the respondent/management, as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a ‘No Claim Award’. Accordingly, ‘No Claim Award’ is passed in the present reference for the non-prosecution of workmen.
3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer-cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 766.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स चरणजीत सिंह मन्हास सिक्योरिटी एजेंसी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्रीमती जीतो देवी के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 07/2019) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/12/2019- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 766.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Reference No. 07/2019) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court-1, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to M/s Charanjit Singh Manhas Security Agency and Smt. Jeeto Devi which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-30012/12/2019-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I, CHANDIGARH.

PRESENT: SH. KAMAL KANT, PRESIDING OFFICER-CUM-LINK OFFICER.

ID No. 7/2019

Registered on:-23.04.2019

Smt. Jeeto Devi, Ladies Security Guard, C/o IOC Bottling Plant, Kartholi, Bari Brahmana, District-Samba(J&K).

.....Workman

Versus

M/s Charanjeet Singh Manhas Security Agency, Post Office-Paloura, Near Raina Higher Secondary School, Jammu(J&K).

.....Management

AWARD

Passed on:-27.03.2024

Central Government vide Notification No.L-30012/12/2019-IR(M) Dated 3.4.2019, under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(hereinafter called the Act), has referred the following Industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:-

“Whether the claim of Smt. Jeeto Devi, the Ex-Ladies Security Guard vide letter dated 9.7.2018 that her services were terminated w.e.f. 1.7.2018 by M/s Charanjeet Singh Manhas Security Agency, Post Office-Paloura, Near Raina Higher Secondary School, Jammu(J&K) a contractor of M/s India Oil LPG Bottling Plant, Kartholi, Bari Brahmana, District Samba(J&K) is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the disputant is entitled to and from which date?

1. On the receipt of the above reference, notice was sent to the workman as well as to the respondent/management. The postal article sent to the workman, referred above, is duly delivered to the workman. The workman is given sufficient opportunities to file claim statement but none turned up in spite of the opportunity afforded to file claim statement, which shows that the workman is not interested in adjudication of the matter on merit. The workman has not appeared on 15.7.2019, 23.09.2019, 2.12.2019, 19.2.2020, 8.5.2020, 30.07.2020, 11.11.2020, 17.2.2021, 28.5.2021, 9.9.2021, 24.12.2021, 12.04.2022, 28.7.2022, 14.11.2022, 11.1.2023, 22.3.2023, 6.6.2023, 20.9.2023, 30.11.2023 and today also i.e. 27.3.2024 none turned up on behalf of workman.

2. Since the workman has neither put his appearance nor she has filed any statement of claim to prove his cause against the respondent/management, as such, this Tribunal is left with no choice, except to pass a 'No Claim Award'. Accordingly, 'No Claim Award' is passed in the present reference for the non-prosecution of workman.
3. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer-Cum-Link Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 767.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ए.वी. जोशी एंड कंपनी; फ्रेंड एंड फ्रेंड शिपिंग प्रा. लिमिटेड; गौतम फ्रेट प्रा. लिमिटेड; तारापंथ फूड प्रा. लिमिटेड; फ्रेंड्स साल्ट एंड अलाइड इंडस्ट्रीज और फ्रेंड्स ऑयल एंड केमिकल्स टर्मिनल्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री प्रजापति कान्तिभाई मूलजीभाई के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 06/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. जेड-16025/04/2024- आईआर(एम)-43]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 767.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 06/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Ahmedabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **A.V. Joshi & Company; Friend & Friend Shipping Pvt. Ltd.; Gautam Freight Pvt. Ltd.; Tarapanth Food Pvt. Ltd.; Friends Salt & Allied Industries and Friends Oil & Chemicals Terminals and Shri Prajapati Kantibhai Muljibhai** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. Z-16025/04/2024-IR(M)-43]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, AHMEDABAD

Present....

Sunil Kumar Singh-I,

Presiding Officer, CGIT cum Labour Court,

Ahmedabad,

Dated 13th March, 2024.

Industrial Dispute (CGITA) No. - 06/2018

Prajapati Kantibhai Muljibhai,

Plot No.106, Sector No.4,

Oslo Society, Gandhidham,

Kachchh-370201.

..... Applicant

V/s

1. A.V. Joshi & Company
2. Friend & Friend Shipping Pvt. Ltd.
3. Gautam Freight Pvt. Ltd.
4. Tarapanth Food Pvt. Ltd.
5. Friends Salt & Allied Industries
6. Friends Oil & Chemicals Terminals,
A Group of Friends Company,
Maitri Bhavan, Plot No.18,
Sector-9, Gandhidham,
Kachchh-370201.

..... Opponent

For the Applicant

: Shri Gordhan Prajapati

For the Opponent

: Shri Prabhatsinh J. Parmar

AWARD

The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Ahmedabad had issued the certificate vide No. ALC/ADP/08(12)2018 dated 20.06.2018 to the applicant for filing claim in this Tribunal.

1. The applicant filed his statement of claim Ex.1 under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 on 31.08.2018 consequent upon the demand of alleged termination from service w.e.f. April, 2016.
2. Case called out. Parties represented through Ld. Counsels. Ex.23 moved on behalf of the Second Party/workman to withdraw this reference on the ground that the parties have settled their dispute out of court and does not wish to proceed further in the matter and prayed to withdraw the same. Not opposed by First Party/employer. Ex.23 is thus allowed. The reference stands withdrawn as prayed. Let the records be consigned after due formalities.
3. The award is passed as above. The award be sent for publication U/s 17(1) of Industrial Disputes Act.

SUNIL KUMAR SINGH-I, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 768.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स अंबुजा सीमेंट लिमिटेड; मैसर्स एन.के. शर्मा एंड कंपनी (प्रोप्राइटर) के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री ए.के. सिंह, वाईस प्रेजिडेंट/श्री एस.एन. आदिश्वर, जॉइंट सेक्रेटरी, श्री गुजरात अंबुजा सीमेंट कर्मचारी संघ के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, अहमदाबाद, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 23/2023) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/03/2023- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 768.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 23/2023**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Ahmedabad** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Ambuja Cement Limited; M/s N.K. Sharma & Company (Proprietor)** and **Shri A.K. Singh, Vice President/Shri S. N. Adishwar, Jt. Secretary, The Shree Gujarat Ambuja Cement Karmachari Sangh** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-29011/03/2023-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
AHMEDABAD

Present....

Sunil Kumar Singh-I,
 Presiding Officer, CGIT cum Labour Court,
 Ahmedabad,

Dated 14th March, 2024.

Reference: (CGITA) No- 23/2023

1. M/s Ambuja Cement Limited,
 Ambujanagar, Tal. Kodinar, Dist.-Gir Somnath,
 Gir Somnath-362720.
2. M/s N.K. Sharma & Company (Proprietor),
 F- -New North Colony, Ambujanagar,
 Tal-Kodinar, Dist.-Gir Somnath Cement Limited,
 Ambujanagar, Gir Somnath-362720.First Party

V

Shri A.K. Singh, Vice President/Shri S. N. Adishwar, Jt. Secretary,
 The Shree Gujarat Ambuja Cement Karmachari Sangh,
 Ambujanagar, Tal. Kodinar, Dist.-Gir Somnath,
 Gir Somnath-362720.Second Party

Adv. for the FP/employer No.1	: Shri Anil Parikh
Adv. for the FP/employer No.2	: None
Union's representative for the SP/workmen/union	: Shri S. N. Adishwar

AWARD

The Government of India/Ministry of Labour, New Delhi by reference adjudication Order No. L-29011/03/2023-IR(M) dated 13.07.2023 referred the dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal- cum-Labour Court, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule:

SCHEDULE

“Whether the claim of Shree Gujarat Ambuja Cement Karmachari Sangh, Ambujanagar to the management of M/s N. K. Sharma & Co., Contractor under M/s Ambuja Cement Limited, Ambujanagar, Gir Somnath that the management abruptly changed the target from 574 Tons per day to 750 Tons per day(i.e. changing of higher per day output by 30%) without consulting the Union / worker and over looking the local factor and thus have lowered the workers wages which is not just and fair, is proper, legal and justified ? If yes, to what reliefs are the disputant union entitled and what directions, if any, is necessary in the matter?”

1. Case called out. Second Party is represented through Shri S. N. Adishwar representative of workmen/union. FP/employer No.1 Ambuja Cement Limited is represented through Adv. Shri Anil Parikh. None responds for FP/employer No.2 (Contractor). Perusal of the record shows that the FP/employer No.2 has not yet made his appearance in the proceedings. Withdrawal application Ex.6 moved on behalf of the SP workmen/union to withdraw the case on the ground that the concerned workmen have settled their dispute with the employers in respect of their legal dues. Hence they do not want to proceed further in the matter Withdrawal application has not been opposed by the FP employer No.1 in attendance. In the circumstances no service needs to effected upon the absentee FP/employer No.2. The case stands withdrawn as prayed.

Let two copies of the Award be sent to the Appropriate Government for the needful and for publication U/s 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

SUNIL KUMAR SINGH-I, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 769.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स भिलाई स्टील प्लांट, सेल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और भिलाई इस्पात कर्मचारी संघ के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 13/2018) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-26011/31/2017- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 769.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 13/2018**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s Bhilai Steel Plant, SAIL** and **Bhilai ispat Karmachari Union** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-26011/31/2017-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/13/2018

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

The Dy. General Secretary,
Bhilai Ispat Karmachari Union,
2/C, Street-13, Sector-04, Bhilai Nagar,
Dist.– Durg (C.G.) – 490001

Workman

Versus

The Chief Executive Officer,
M/s Bhilai Steel Plant, SAIL,
PO-Bhilai, Distt. Durg(C.G.)
Pin Code – 490001

Management

AWARD

(Passed on this 03rd day of April-2024.)

As per letter dated 09/03/2018 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number L-26011/31/2017-IR(M) dt. 09/03/2018. The dispute under reference related to :-

“ Whether the discriminatory action of management of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai in arranging excess recovery of HBA i.r.o. Shri Annulal Yadav, Sr. Operative (P.No. 138891) as alleged ignoring the provision of law and without following the established norms is just, fair and legal? If not, what relief the workman represented through Bhilai Ispat Karmachari Union is entitled to? ”

After registering the case on reference received, notices were sent to the parties and were duly served on them. Time was allotted to the workman to submit his statement of claim. In spite of the allotment of time and service of notice, the workman never turned up and submitted his statement of claim. Management filed its written statement of claim/ defence along with documents. No evidence was ever produced by any of the parties in this Tribunal.

Due to the absence of the workman reference proceeded ex-parte by order dated 13/09/2022. I have heard ex-parte argument, perused the records submitted by management. The reference is itself the issue. No evidence was ever produced by any of the parties in this Tribunal.

The initial burden to prove his claim is on the workman. Since the workman did not file any pleading nor did he file any evidence, in the absence of any evidence in support of holding the claim of the workman not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against the workman and is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In the light of this factual backdrop, holding that the claim of the workman is not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against the Workman and is answered accordingly.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K.SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

DATE: 03/04/2024

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 770.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेंस कंपनी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्री उमेश केवट के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 35/2013) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17012/36/2012- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 770.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 35/2013**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **United India Insurance Company** and **Shri Umesh Kewat** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-17012/36/2012-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR**

NO. CGIT/LC/R/35/2013

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

Shri Umesh Kewat,

S/o Sh. Moledas Kewat,

Behind Charoula Post Office,

W.No. 13, Shahdol, Distt Shahdol (M.P.)

Workman

VERSUS

**The Branch Manager,
United India Insurance Company,
Main Road Shahdol
Distt. Shahdol (M.P.)**

Management

AWARD

(Passed on this 09th day of April-2024.)

As per letter dated 07/02/2013 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this tribunal under section-10 of I.D. Act, 1947 as per reference number L-17012/36/2012 - (IR(M)) dt. 07/02/2013. The dispute under reference related to :-

“ Whether the action of the management of the Branch Manager, United India Insurance Company, Branch Shahdol, in terminating the services of Shri Umesh Kewat workman is legal and justified ? What relief the workman is entitled to ? ”

After registering the case on reference received, notices were sent to the parties and were duly served on them. Both the sides appeared and filed their respective Statements of Claim and Defense.

According to the workman, he was engaged as a daily casual worker by management and worked from January 2008 till 2010 continuously. He was terminated by management without any notice or compensation which is against law. He has sort the relief of his reinstatement with all back wages and benefits.

Case of management is that he was a daily waiger engaged as and when required and not a regular worker, never completed 240 days in any year.

No evidence was produced by workman. Management filed affidavit of its witness which is not cross-examined.

No counsel present for any of the parties at argument stage, perused record, reference is the issue for determination.

The Initial burden to prove his claim is on the workman. Since the workman did not file any pleading nor did he file any evidence, in the absence of any evidence in support of holding the claim of the workman not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against the workman and is answered accordingly.

AWARD

In the light of this factual backdrop, holding that the claim of the workman is not proved, the reference deserves to be answered against the Workman and is answered accordingly.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

DATE: 09/04/2024

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 771.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेसर्स भिलाई स्टील प्लांट, सेल; मेसर्स नंदिनी माइंस ऑफ़ भिलाई स्टील प्लांट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और मेटल माइंस वर्कर्स यूनियन(इंटक) के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स न.- 44/2019) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-26011/2/2019- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 771.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 44/2019**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M/s. Bhilai Steel Plant, SAIL; M/s. Nandini Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant and Metal Mines Workers Union (INTUC)** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-26011/2/2019-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/44/2019

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd)

The President

Metal Mines Workers Union (INTUC)

Branch – Nandini Mines, Qtr. No.- 2/B,

Street No.-27, Nandini Township,

District – Durg (C.G.)

Workman

Versus

1. The Executive Director (Mines)

M/s. Bhilai Steel Plant, SAIL, Ispat Bhawan

Bhilai, Durg (C.G.)

2. Dy. General Manager

M/s. Nandini Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant

Bhilai, Durg (C.G.)

Management

(JUDGEMENT)

(Passed on this 1st day of April 2024)

Vide letter no.-L/26011/2/2019/IR(M), dated 12.04.2019, the Government of India, through Ministry of Labour and Employment, has sent following reference for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

“Whether there is employer-employee relationship between Smt. Jamuna Sunani and the Management of Bhilai Steel Plant SAIL, within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act 1947 ? If so whether Smt. Jamuna Sunani is entitled for regularization of service on the rolls of Bhilai Steel Plant and for wages as claimed by Metal Mines Worker Union latter dated 16.06.2018 or to any other better scheme of relief ? What directions, if any, are necessary in this matter ?”

After registering a case on the basis of the reference, notices were sent to the parties. They appeared and file their respective Statements of Claim and Defense.

According to the Union, the management runs a crutch/ day care and a school for the welfare of children of its workers and their education. The management provides the required infrastructure of it. The workman Mrs. Jamuna Sunani was appointed as a Teacher by management vide order dated 02.11.1987 and since then she had been running this day care till 2008 when the management stopped paying salary to her without issuing any order in writing though the centre has been in operation even after 2008. The workman was also engaged in the work of cleaning, feeding the infants and other related jobs like maintaining the records of the day care centre. She has putting more than 22 years in service and was never subjected to any disciplinary action. She has worked continuously for

more than 240 days in every year till date of her disengagement. According to the workman union the establishment is and Industry and the workman is a workman as defined U/S. 2(j) and 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, hereinafter referred by to the word 'Act'. Thus the action of management amounts to retrenchment as define U/S. 2(oo) of the Act and is in violation of Section 25F, 25H, 25G and 25N of the Act. Accordingly it has been prayed that the reference be answered in favour of the Union and Management be directed to absorb the workman by regularizing her in appropriate category or reinstate her in the same capacity alongwith full back wages and consequential benefits.

According to management, as claimed by workman union, the applicant was working as a Teacher providing education and training to the children of the workers working in Nandini Mines, hence she is not a workman as defined U/S. 2(s) of the Act. It is further the case of management that the applicant was never appointed by Bhilai Steel Plant as they never run any day care centre. The applicant was never paid any wages by management. The Centre was run by a group of employee themselves. The management only provided free accommodation on their request. This Centre was closed in the year 2008. Accordingly the management has prayed that the reference be answered against the workman union.

In evidence, the workman side filed a certificate dated 12.02.1999 admitted by management, marked Ex. W/1. They further filed RTI documents which are marked Ex. W/2 to Ex. W/11, to be referred to as and when required.

Workman Smt. Jamuna Sunani filed her affidavit as her examination in chief. She has been cross examined by management.

Management has not filed any documentary or oral evidence.

I have heard argument of Mr. K.B. Singh learned Counsel for the workman union and Mr. Ashish Shrivastava learned Counsel for management. I have also gone through the record.

On perusal of record in the light of rival arguments, following issues come up for determination –

1. Whether Smt. Jamuna Sunani is a workman under the Act ?
2. Whether termination of services of Smt. Jamuna Sunani can be faulted in law ?
3. Relief if any.

Issue No.-1 –

Pleadings of the parties on this issue have already been detailed earlier. Before proceedings into the merits of claim and counter claim, Section 2(j) & 2(s) of the Act are being reproduced as follows –

2(j) “industry” means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft, or industrial occupation or avocation of workmen;

2(s) “workman” means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person—

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or
- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding ten thousand rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.

As it is the case of the workman, she was employed by management of Bhilai Steel Plant as a Teacher and was required to do all other works like cleaning of the campus, maintaining accounts and different registers as well as a maid for the kids. She has stated so in her statement, in her affidavit as her examination in chief. In her cross examination, she could not produce her appointment letter she states that vacancy was notified on the notice board and she had applied for it and also that she appeared in an interview for this post and then she was selected. She further states that she was paid her salary by the Personnel Officer/ Labour Officer of the management. She specifically denied that she was paid from the fund collected by the parents of the children.

She has filed interview intimation issued by the Mines Manager which is Ex. W/1 & W/3 which shows that she was called for interview with reference to her application for the post of Teacher. There appears some overwriting

over her name which indicates that the word Janki has been made Jamuna by overwriting. Case of management is that it is not a genuine document because its original has been withheld by the workman. Even if this document is believed, it only shows that she was called for interview. In absence of any appointment order in her favour, only this interview letter cannot lead to an inference that she was appointed also. Ex. W/4 is a certificate which goes to show that she is voluntarily running a nursery school at recreation club Nandini. Ex. W/5 to W/8 are RTI documents regarding furniture and receipt/expenses statement as well her salary slips for some months but it is not clear as to who paid this salary. Ex. W/8 are photographs of children with her. Ex. W/9 are some marksheets which bear her name as Class Teacher.

From perusal of these documents also her relationship as an employee with the management of Bhilai Steel Plant is not established.

From the above discussion, it is established that the applicant could not prove herself to be an employee of management of Bhilai Steel Plant and thus her claim that she is a workman with respect to the management of Bhilai Steel Plant is held not proved. Issue No.-1 is answered accordingly.

Issue No.-2 & 3 –

In the light of findings recorded on issue no.-1, issue no.-2 & 3 are answered against the workman union.

Accordingly, following award is passed.

AWARD

Holding no employer-employee relationship between Smt. Jamuna Sunani and management of Bhilai Steel Plant within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Act, she is held to be entitled to no relief. No order as to cost.

DATE:- 01/04/2024

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 772.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एम.पी. स्टेट माइनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और श्रीमती वंदना दीक्षित के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण एवं श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर, पंचाट (रिफरेन्स नं.- 49/2016) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 22.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/20/2015- आईआर(एम)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 2024

S.O. 772.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (**Reference No. 49/2016**) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur** as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **M.P. State Mining Corporation** and **Smt. Vandana Dixit** which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 22.04.2024.

[No. L-29012/20/2015-IR(M)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT,
JABALPUR**

NO. CGIT/LC/R/49/2016

Present: P.K.Srivastava

H.J.S..(Retd.)

Smt. Vandana Dixit W/o. Sh. Balram Dixit
C/o. Pandit Deendayal Nagar, LIG-1171
Makroniya, Sagar (M.P.)

Workman

Versus

The Managing Director
M.P. State Mining Corporation
Paryavas Bhawan, Block-A, 2nd Floor
Jail Road, Arera Hills, Bhopal (M.P.)

Management

AWARD

(Passed on this 15th day of March 2024)

As per letter dated 02/06/2016 by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, the reference is received. The reference is made to this Tribunal under Section -10 of I.D.Act, 1947 as per Notification No. L-29012/20/2015-IR(M) dt. 02/06/2016. The dispute under reference relates to:

- 1. Whether Smt. Vandana Dixit who was appointed by M.P. Mining Corporation Ltd. At Heerapur Office, District Sagar vide order dated 19.06.1996 on contingency basis/ daily wage basis as LDC had completed 240 days prior to her termination on 13.06.1997 ?**
- 2. Whether the appointment of Smt. Vandana Dixit as daily wage LDC vide order dated 19.06.1996 of M.P. Mining Corporation Ltd. On compassionate ground is valid legal and proper under the provisions of Companies Rules or not ?**
- 3. Whether the reason given by the M.P. Mining Corporation that due to closure of their office at Bara Hadwar one of the regular LDC was posted to Heerapur Office, and due to availability of surplus staff on regular basis, the service of Smt. Vandana Dixit was discontinued from Daily Wage basis w.e.f. 13.06.1997 is justified or not ?**
- 4. Whether the termination of Smt. Vandana Dixit, vide order dated 10.06.1997 by the M.P. Mining Corporation is legal, justified and proper ?**
- 5. Whether Smt. Vandana Dixit is entitled to be reinstated to the service of M.P. Mining Corporation Ltd. or not ? if not, what relief she is entitled to ?”**

After registering a case on the basis of the reference notices were sent to the parties. They appeared and filed their respective statement of claim and defense.

According to the workman she was appointed vide order of management dated 19.06.1996 and worked continuously for more than 240 days till the date of termination of her services by management on 13.06.1996 vide order of management no. 97-98/658. She had submitted an application alongwith her testimonials to the management and her case was considered by management. She was offered appointment on compassionate ground as LDC on Daily Wage basis. She joined her services at Heerapur from where she was transferred on 08.08.1996 to Sagar Office till her termination. According to the workman by continuously working for 240 days, she had right to be protected under Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (hereinafter referred as to word “Act”). She raised a dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner who first refused to refer the dispute to Central Government. She challenged this order before Hon’ble High Court of M.P. by filing W.P. No.- 20863/2015 and it was under the direction of Hon’ble High Court, the dispute was referred to this Tribunal. Before this, she had raised a dispute in this respect before the Assistant Labour Commissioner State of M.P. who referred the dispute to the State Labor Court at Sagar which was registered as Case No. 4/2010 and was decided on 30.08.2014 holding that the dispute was cognizable not by the State Labour Court. According to the workman she was terminated from service without notice or compensation which is in violation of the Act. She has sought the relief of her reinstatement with all back wages and benefits.

The case of management is mainly that she was appointed as compassionate ground. It was later found that her husband was working with Education Department and this fact was not disclosed by her. More over her services were terminated because the Bara Hadwar office was closed and there was already surplus staff in the regular cadre. According to the management her termination is not retrenchment hence no notice or compensation was required. Management has prayed that the reference be answered against the workman.

The workman filed her rejoinder wherein she mainly reiterated her case.

In evidence, the workman filed her affidavit she filed and proved document which are Ex.- W/1 her application for appointment, Ex.- W/2 Office Note recommending her appointment and termination, Ex.- W/3 application, Ex.- W/4 appointment order, Ex.- W/5 joining report, Ex.- W/6 transfer order, Ex.- W/7 joining report at place of transfer, Ex.- W/7/2 cancellation of appointment, Ex.- W/8 experience certificate, Ex.- W/9 second application, Ex.- W/10 third application for appointment, Ex.- W/11 application for bonus, Ex.- W/12 to W/15 are documents regarding raising dispute and case before State Labour Court as well award of State Labour Court, to be referred to as and when required. The workman has examined herself on oath. She has been cross examined.

No evidence, documentary or oral has been adduced by management.

I have heard argument of Shri Uttam Maheshwari learned Counsel for workman. None appeared for management at the stage of argument, no written argument has been filed by any of the parties. I have gone through the record.

The reference itself is the issue for determination.

Point No.-1:-

This point is whether the workman has completed 240 days in continuous service prior to her termination on 13.06.1997.

Section 25-B of the Act which defines continuous service is being reproduced as follows:-

25B. Definition of continuous service.—For the purposes of this Chapter,— (1) a workman shall be said to be in continuous service for a period if he is, for that period, in uninterrupted service, including service which may be interrupted on account of sickness or authorised leave or an accident or a strike which is not illegal, or a lock-out or a cessation of work which is not due to any fault on the part of the workman;

(2) where a workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (1) for a period of one year or six months, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service under an employer—

(a) for a period of one year, if the workman, during a period of twelve calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—

- (i) one hundred and ninety days in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and
- (ii) two hundred and forty days, in any other case;

(b) for a period of six months, if the workman, during a period of six calendar months preceding the date with reference to which calculation is to be made, has actually worked under the employer for not less than—

- (i) ninety-five days, in the case of a workman employed below ground in a mine; and
- (ii) one hundred and twenty days, in any other case.

Explanation.—For the purposes of clause (2), the number of days on which a workman has actually worked under an employer shall include the days on which—

(i) he has been laid-off under an agreement or as permitted by standing orders made under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 (20 of 1946), or under this Act or under any other law applicable to the industrial establishment;

(ii) he has been on leave with full wages, earned in the previous years;

(iii) he has been absent due to temporary disablement caused by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment; and

(iv) in the case of a female, she has been on maternity leave; so, however, that the total period of such maternity leave does not exceed twelve weeks.

According to the workman, she was appointed on 19.06.1996 and continuously worked for more than 240 days till her termination from service by management on 13.06.1997. The workman has corroborated her this case in her statement on oath and has been cross examined by management on this point there is nothing in her statement to discredit her on this point. Management has nowhere specifically denied this allegation of the workman in their written statement of defense and have not filed any oral or documentary evidence to controvert this allegation from the workman side. The documents Ex.-W/1 to W/14 further corroborate this case of the workman. These documents have been detailed earlier in this judgment.

Hence, on the light of above discussion, the case of the workman that she has completed 240 days prior to her termination on 13.06.1997 by management and this point is answered accordingly.

Point No.-2:-

As regards point no.-2 of the reference, admitted between the parties is the fact that the workman was appointed as a daily wage. No rule regarding the procedure of appointment of daily wage employees has been cited from the side of management. Both the parties have stated that she was appointed on humanitarian grounds/ compassionate grounds. The workman side has not referred to any provision empowering the management/ to recruit on humanitarian grounds. A compassionate appointment is offered when the earning member is no more and the dependant who is seeking such appointment satisfies the management that he fulfills all the other conditions and is otherwise eligible. Admittedly the husband of the workman is working with the Government. Hence, she could not have been appointed on compassionate ground also but she could well be appointed as a daily wage employee by management. It is proved that she was appointed as daily wage employee hence, her appointment as daily wage employee cannot be held bad in law and this point is answered accordingly.

Point No.-3 & 4 :-

Since these two points of the reference are interconnected, they are being taken together. Section 25-F and 25-G of the Act are being referred to as follows before entering into any discussion :-

25F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen.—No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until—

(a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;

(b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and

(c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.

25G. Procedure for retrenchment.—Where any workman in an industrial establishment, who is a citizen of India, is to be retrenched and he belongs to a particular category of workmen in that establishment, in the absence of any agreement between the employer and the workman in this behalf, the employer shall ordinarily retrench the workman who was the last person to be employed in that category, unless for reasons to be recorded the employer retrenches any other workman.

The ground taken by management for termination of the services of the workman is that due to closure of one office of management, there was surplus of regular employees hence naturally, the daily wage employee will be shown the door in such a situation.

There is nothing to record to show that the workman was issued any prior notice or compensation before her disengagement by management. Hence, termination of services is held in violation of the above referred provisions of the Act. Point No.-3 & 4 of the reference are answered accordingly.

Point No.-5 :-

In the light of finding on point no.-3 & 4, the question arises as to what relief the workman is entitled.

The learned Counsel for workman has submitted that in such a situation, the workman requires in law to be reinstated with back wages and benefits. Learned Counsel for management has opposed this argument.

It comes out from record that there is nothing on record that the workman was appointed against a sanctioned and regular vacancy. This also established that no recruitment procedure was followed in her appointment. Also it is established that she was given appointment as a daily wage employee. There is nothing on record that there are sanctioned posts available and vacant at present. Hence, in these circumstances, her reinstatement will not be proper in law. In the considered view of this Tribunal after considering all the facts the interest of justice will be served if she is awarded lump sum compensation in lieu of all her claims which is quantified at Rs. 1,00,000/- only payable to her within 30 days from the date of publication of award in official Gazette failing which interest of the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of award till payment.

Point No.-5 is answered accordingly.

In the light of above discussion, following award is passed.

AWARD

Holding the termination of services of the workman against the Act, she is held entitled to compensation in lieu of all her claims which is quantified at Rs. 1,00,000/- only payable to her within 30 days from the date of publication of award in official Gazette failing which interest of the rate of 6% p.a. from the date of award till payment.

Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

P. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

DATE: 15/03/2024

नई दिल्ली, 23 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 773.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार **बाटा इंडिया लिमिटेड**, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके संघ/कामगार, के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण- सह-श्रम न्यायालय, कोलकाता, पंचाट(संदर्भ संख्या **NT-02 OF 2007**) को जैसा कि अनुलग्नक में दिखाया गया है, प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को सॉफ्ट कॉपी के साथ 23.04.2024 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42025/07-2024-66- आईआर(डीयू)]

दिलीप कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd April, 2024

S.O. 773—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. NT-02 OF 2007) of the **Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Kolkata**, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to **The Bata India Ltd., and Their Union /, Workmen**, which was received along with soft copy of the award by the Central Government on 23.04.2024.

[No. L-42025/07-2024-66-IR(DU)]

DILIP KUMAR, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA

Present : Justice K. D. Bhutia, Presiding Officer.

Ref. NT- 02 OF 2007

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of

Bata India Ltd.

AND

Their Union/Workmen

Appearance :

On behalf of the Management: Mr. Ranjay De, Ld. Advocate.

On behalf of the Union/Workmen : Mr. Partha Bhanja Chowdhury, Ld.

Advocate.

Dated: 21st February, 2024

AWARD

By order dated 5th September, 2007, the Central Govt., Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:-

“Whether the action of M/s. Bata India Ltd. in terminating the service of 220 (later corrected as 236 by virtue of Ministry’s letter dated 20-07-2016) Shop Managers of retail shop stores, as per Annexure-I without holding any domestic enquiry is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?”

The facts giving rise to the present reference in gist are that Bata India Ltd. has obtained necessary orders from respective State Governments for keeping the company’s retail outlets open for 365 days up to 9-30 p.m. But concerned Union expressed its inability before the management to keep the store open for 365 days up to 9-30 p.m. due to shortage in staff strength in different outlets. Further, the union has alleged in view of terms and conditions contained in bipartite settlement 1952, the working hours of the stores was from 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. and which was modified from time to time every three years till 2004. The management failed to provide sufficient staff to keep the stores running for 365 days from 10 a.m. to 9-30 p.m. as agreed and which resulted in extra work pressure upon the employees of the retail stores due to additional working hours. When the management failed to redress such problem faced by the stores, then the concerned union decided to call for a strike on 16-09-2006 and 28-09-2006 by issuing a joint notice on 01-09-2006. On issuance of such notice the management called union for a discussion on 26-09-2006 and the union decided to withdraw the strike called on 28-09-2006.

Thereafter, all on a sudden the company terminated and dismissed the services of 236 Shop Managers of different stores located in different parts of the country or States on different dates from 18-02-2007 to 08-05-2007. Those Retail Store Managers were terminated from the service for calling All India Strike on 24-02-2007 and that too without any service of show cause notice, charge sheet or without holding domestic enquiry or giving opportunity of being heard.

The union have alleged the ground of termination of those 236 shop Managers was for not operating shops for 365 days till 9-00/9-30 p.m. and for participating in the strike held on 16-09-2006 and 24-02-2007 and for instigating the other members to observe strikes on 16-09-2006 and 24-02-2007.

That the union being aggrieved by such illegal/irrational termination of service of those Store Managers ventilated its grievances before the Management but the Management did not pay any heed. Finding no other alternative union has to raise an industrial dispute before the Labour Commissioner against illegal termination of 236 Store Managers. Unfortunately, Labour Commissioner has failed to settle such dispute and as such the matter was referred to the Ministry of Labour and who in turn referred the dispute regarding alleged illegal termination of 236 Shop/Store Managers to this Tribunal for adjudication. Thus, they have prayed for quashing the order of termination, reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

The management contested the case of the union by filing written statement, where it has alleged that the Shop/Store Managers of M/s. Bata India Ltd. are not workmen, but persons holding Managerial posts. That there exists no industrial dispute between the management of Bata India Ltd. and its Store/Shop Managers of retail outlets. Thus, they have prayed for dismissal of the reference.

The union in order to prove its case and claim has examined Sri Jayanta Kumar Ghosh, one of the terminated Store Managers as W.W. No.1 and an another terminated Store Manager Sri Sandip Kumar Ghosh as W.W. No.2.

That as per order dated 13-08-2015, 17 documents that have been produced by the union have been marked as Exhibit-W-1 to Exhibit-W-17 on formal proof being dispensed with.

On the other hand the management has examined Sri Asutosh Ghosh, the General Manager of M/s. Bata India Ltd. as M.W. No.1 and through him Annual Performance Report of Salesmen has been marked as Exhibit-M-1 on 22-04-2014. But the order sheet dated 06-08-2014 reflects the remaining 132 documents filed by the management have been marked as Exhibit-M-2 to Exhibit-M-133 on formal proof being dispensed with.

That Ld. Counsel for the management in support of his submission referred to the following decisions:-

1. Sonepat Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd. –vs – Ajit Singh (2005) 3 SCC 232.
2. Electronics Corpn. of India Ltd. –vs- Electronics Corpn. of India Service Engineers Union, (2006) 7 SCC 330.
3. Bata India Ltd. & Ors. –vs- S. K. Chawla, 2005 III CLR 727.
4. Order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No. 26424/2005 dated 17-04-2006.
5. K. Hanumantharayappa –vs- Management of Indian Express (P) Ltd, Chennai LAWS (KAR) 2012 6 242.
6. Delhi Transport Corporation –vs- Shyam Lal (2004) 8 SCC 88.
7. S. K.Maini –vs- M/s. Carona Saha Company Ltd. & Ors. (1994) 3 SCC 510 and
8. Sarat Kumar Basu –vs- NCT of Delhi LAWS (SC) 2002 – 4 – 86.

While Ld. Counsel for the Union has referred to the following decisions in support of his contention:-

1. Ananda Bazar Patrika Pvt. Ltd. –vs Workmen 1970 (3) SCC 248.
2. Chandulal –vs- Management M/s. Pan American World Airways Inc. (1985) 2 SCC 727.
3. Lloyds Bank Ltd., vs- Pannalal Gupta & Ors. AIR 1967 SC 428 and
4. Agricultural Produce Market Committee –vs- Parasram Daga Patil, (2017) 6 AIR Bom R 735.

It is undisputed fact that 236 persons whose cause have been raised by the union were working as Shop/Store Managers of retail shops of Bata India Ltd. situated in different parts of India at the time of their termination in between 18-02-2007 to 08-05-2007.

The main allegation of the union is that those Shop Managers were not served with any show cause notice or they have not been served with any charge sheet and no domestic enquiry was held against them. They have been terminated from their services by the management in violation of principle of natural justice. Further, it is the contention of the Union, those shop Managers were governed by Standing Orders and Rules for Shop Managers, 1979

and as such they are workmen as defined in Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act. That this Tribunal has jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute under reference.

On the other hand, the management has alleged those Shop Managers are not workmen but persons holding managerial and administrative posts and as such there exists no industrial dispute in between the management of M/s. Bata India Ltd. and its terminated Store Managers.

Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta, in McLeod and Co. –vs- Sixth Industrial Tribunal, W.B. AIR, 1958 CAL 273, has been pleased to observe whether a person is a workman within the definition of the Industrial Disputes Act, would be the very foundation of the jurisdiction of the Industrial Tribunal.

Thus, having regards to the submission made by the Ld. Counsels for both parties and the above observation of the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta the first question that needs to be determined is whether those 236 Shop Managers of retail shoe shops of Bata India Ltd. falls within the definition of workman or not. If the answer is affirmative then this Tribunal will have jurisdiction to decide the issue under reference and if the answer is negative, then those Shop Managers not being workman, then this Tribunal will lack jurisdiction to decide the dispute under reference.

The term 'workman' has been defined in Section 2(s) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 as follows:-

"Workman" means any person (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person—

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or
- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding 3[tен thousand rupees] per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature.] (That rupees ten thousand has substituted Rs.1,600/- w.e.f. 15-09-2010).

From the above definition it becomes clear that all workmen are employees but all employees may not be workmen. Only a workman/workmen can raise an industrial dispute with the employer regarding his/their dismissal, discharge or retrenchment or termination of his/their service and not by all the employees. As per the definition of workman as provided in section 2 (s) in order to become a workman, an employee must be engaged in merely seven types of work i.e. manual, skilled, unskilled, technical, operation, clerical and supervisory works. However, large number of employees are often required to do more than one work than it becomes necessary to determine under which all the seven classification the employees will fall in order to determine whether he qualifies as a workman.

The definition of workman specifically excludes a persona working in a managerial or administrative capacity. The mere designation of a person as manager or administrator of an industry is not sufficient to conclude that he is not workman. To ascertain his status as workman the nature of duties assigned to him are relevant and such question is determined with reference to the facts and circumstances of the case and materials on record and the real nature of duties and functions performed by an employee.

More so, while interpreting the term 'workman' by different Hon'ble High Courts and Hon'ble Supreme Court in several decisions, it was held nature of work assigned and performed by an employee need to be considered. If a workman is mainly engaged in work which is of manual, clerical or technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisory or other work is also done by him incidentally or as a small fraction of his work, will take him out of the purview of the definition of a workman. The dominant purpose of employment must be first taken into consideration and the gloss of some additional duties must be rejected while determining the status and character of a person. The definition of workman specifically excludes a person working in a managerial or administrative capacity. The mere designation of a person as a manager or an administrator of an industry is not sufficient to conclude that he is not a workman. For instance where an employee is mainly engaged in supervisory work and if he ask incidentally to do some clerical work, thus additional duties cannot change the character and status of the person and he will be considered as a workman doing supervisor works. If a workman is mainly engaged to work just of manual, clerical or technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisor and other works is also done incidentally or as a small fraction of his work will not take him out of the purview of the definition of a workman. In other words, the domain purpose of employment must be first taken into consideration and the gloss of some additional duties may be rejected while determining the status and character of a person.

A person to be a workman under I.D. Act must be employed to do work of any of the categories as mentioned u/s 2(s). The same must be established even if he does not perform manager or supervisory duties. It must be established that he performs skilled, unskilled, supervisory, technical or clerical for higher or reward. Therefore, it is to be considered while determining whether an employee is a workman or not is (1) employer's employee relationship, (2) power to take disciplinary action, (3) dominant nature of work, (4) authority to sanction leave, (5) assigning duties and distribution of works, (6) power to take decision, (7) power to assign subordinates, (8) supervision and control over the works done.

In Arun Kumar Ramkrishna Datta vs. Gujarat Co-operative Oilseeds Growers Federation Ltd., 2004 (100) FLR 7 (IT Ahmedabad) (Sum) the following test have been laid down :

1. It is the dominant purpose of the employment that is relevant and not some additional duties which may be performed by the employee.
2. It is not the designation of the post held by the employee which is relevant, but what is relevant is the nature of duties performed by the employee.
3. The Court has to find out whether the employee can bind the company in the matter of some decision taken on behalf of the company.
4. What is the nature of the supervisory duties performed by the employee? Do they include directing the subordinates to do their work and/or to oversee their performance?
5. Does the employee have power either to recommend or sanction leave of the workman working under him?
6. Does he have the power to take any disciplinary action against the workmen working under him?
7. Does he have the power to assign duties and distribute the work?
8. Does the employee have the authority to indent material and to distribute the same amongst the workmen?
9. Does the employee have power to supervise the work of men or does he supervise only machines and not the work of men?
10. Does the employee have any workmen working under him and does he write their confidential report?

In view of the above, let me decide whether the Managers of Retail Shops of M/s. Bata India Ltd. falls within the definition of workmen?

First, let me discuss the oral evidence that have come on record. Sri Jayanta Kumar Ghosh, one of the terminated Shop Managers who has been examined as W.W. No.1 in his evidence in chief on affidavit has stated that he joined M/s. Bata India Ltd. as a probationer Salesman on 27-04-1970. That he was confirmed as a Salesman on 27-07-1970. Thereafter, he was promoted to the post of Shop Manager in the year 1976. Since 1976 he has been discharging the function of a Shop Manager in different stores of Bata Shoes situated in West Bengal.

He in his evidence in chief has stated that he used to discharge all the duties and function as stipulated in Standing Orders and Rules for Shop Managers 1979. He has further stated that service conditions of Shop Managers is determined by Memorandum of Settlement. That Shop Managers are workmen. Exhibit-W-18 is the copy of work manual of Shop Managers. During cross examination he has admitted that Exhibit-W-18 does not bear any stamp and signature of the authority who issued the same and that the claim statement is silent that the management issued the work manual Exhibit-W-18 in his favour.

Perused the Exhibit-W-18 which appears to be nature of work manual/skilled/ technical/ operational/ clerical of a Shop Manager during any working day. Surprisingly, the Exhibit-W-18 does not appear to be an official document issued by M/s. Bata India Ltd. to its Store Managers. It simply appears to be a typed document in a computer on a plain paper and not in official letter pad or official correspondence containing memo no. with date and seal and signature of the authority who issued the same on behalf of the Bata India Ltd., the employer. Therefore, this Tribunal is unable to take into consideration such document. In fact it appears to this Tribunal that the union has prepared Exhibit-W-18 just to prove that the Shop Managers were discharging the duties as that of a workman. More so, it is settled principle of law that mere production and marking of a document as exhibit court cannot held to be a due proof of its contents.

During cross examination W.W. No.1 has stated that some of the Shop Managers had raised an industrial dispute challenging their termination before the State Industrial Tribunal. The said Reference case was disposed of with a finding that the Shop Managers of M/s. Bata India Ltd. are not workmen. Challenging the award of State Tribunal, they have moved Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta and where the matter is still pending.

Further, he has admitted that Exhibit-M-2, Annual Performance Rating of Shop Managers for 2002 relating to Sri Soumen Mallick of Bagbazar Branch bears his signature. Exhibit-M-4 and M-15, Temporary Hand Pay Sheet, Exhibit-M-6 to M-9 and M-17, Daily Shop Mirror/ Turnover of Bagbazar Branch bears his signature. Exhibit -M-11

to M-13, M-18 and M-24, provision of staff, check list and salary statement of Bagbazar Branch of M/s. Bata India Ltd. bears his signature. Exhibit-M-23, Stock Accounting of Bagbazar Branch of M/s. Bata India Ltd. bears his signature as Shop Manager. Further, he has admitted that he has not mentioned that he has the authority to sanction leave to his subordinate staff in his chief on affidavit. That he is not in a position to produce any document or record to show that it was his duty that he had to personally open and close the shop or he had to check the frontage and arrange the signboard or that he had to attend customers personally and settle claims or he had to personally take delivery of goods from the transporter or had to unpack the goods, check invoices and despatched the goods to retail store or any shops under the instructions of the management or he had to personally count the money and remit the same.

He has further admitted that Sri Sankar Ghosh, another terminated Shop Manager, had issued charge sheet against Sri Arun Brahma and Exhibit-M-5 is the suspension order of Sri Arun Brahma issued by Sri Sankar Ghosh.

Perused Exhibit-M-5 from where it appears that Sri Sankar Ghosh, Shop Manager of Bata Shoe Store, S.N. Banerjee Road, had placed Sri Arun Brahma, Cashier of the same store under suspension for violating clause iv, xi and xiv u/s 22 of the Standing Order and Rules of Shop Employees and not giving reply to the letter dated 06-04-2004 which was duly received by Sri Arun Brahma. Exhibit-M-5 reveals that instruction was given to Sri Brahma to make future correspondence with the Personnel Department of the company as final decision on his suspension is pending before the Personnel Department. Thus from Exhibit-M-5 it appears that Sri Sankar Ghosh, one of the terminated Managers, had power or authority to place a Cashier of the store in which he was Manager under suspension.

W.W. No. 1 has further stated in his cross that he nowhere in his evidence or in their claim statement have alleged that the nature of duty that of a salesman and Shop Manager is similar. In a retail shop of M/s. Bata India Ltd. as per hierarchy the position of the Shop Manager is on the top, then comes the other staff of the Store namely Salesmen, Shop Assistant and Cashier.

Sri Sandip Kumar Ghosh, W.W. No. 2, another terminated Shop Manager in his evidence in chief on affidavit has admitted, he joined M/s. Bata India Ltd. as a Salesman on 16-07-1974 and he was promoted as a Shop Manager on 21-01-1988. That he worked as Shop Managers in different stores or shops or Branches of M/s. Bata India Ltd. situated within Calcutta and its suburb.

He has stated as per the Standing Order, the duties of a Shop Manager is that of a Supervisor. That he has no administrative duty. That it is the duty of the Shop Managers to keep the sales proceed in the vault, look after the complaints of the customers with regard to the products. That Shop Manager had to disburse the salary of the employees like a Cashier. Shop Manager had to go to bank personally to deposit the sales proceed every day. The Shop Manager had to physically count the stock and make record of the stock. It is the duty of the Shop Manager to maintain the Cash Book, prepare a fortnight statement called 'Cash Accounting Statement' and discharge the work that of a Cashier, Accountant and do manual works. The Shop Manager had to open and close the shop personally and keep the keys of the shop. Shop Manager had to physically verify each and every product of the shop. The Shop Manager had to perform the work of a salesman along with other salesmen of the shop throughout day and night. That Shop Manager had no independent power to take decision in the matter of running the shop. That the Shop Manager had to regulate the expenses of the store from the sales proceeds. Shop Manager has no disciplinary power as the same is exercised by the Area Manager and the District Managers. That standing order for the Shop Manager provides a clause for strike which amply proves that Shop Manager is a workman. That his last drawn salary was Rs.15,000/- per month.

During cross examination he has stated that he was deposing on behalf of the terminated Shop Managers. That job responsibilities of Shop Managers of Bata Retail Stores throughout India is same. That he has gone through Exhibit-M-3 the job responsibilities of Shop Managers. The nature of job responsibilities described by the management in Exhibit-M-3 is correct. He has further admitted that there is no specific mention in their claim statement what type of manual and clerical job the Shop Managers used to discharge or the claim statement is silent that the Shop Managers were required to sale shoes throughout the day. He has also admitted that he joined the company as a Salesman and later he was promoted as a Shop Manager. That he never complaint before the management of the company that despite being a Shop Manager he was made to discharge the function of a Salesman or that job of a Shop Assistant or Cashier. He has stated that it was his duty to show the products to the customers coming to the store but he has stated that he has no document to prove that such duty was assigned to a Manager or that he was authorised to disburse the salary of the employees of the store or produce any document to prove that without his signature on the salary sheet management approve the salary of workmen working under him. He has stated, appointment and dismissal are dealt with by the Human Resource Department. Expenses were incurred as per policy of the company. He has admitted that Shop Manager is authorised to sign salary statement, daily mirror and salary data sheet of a shop for the workmen working under him.

That Management has examined Sri Asutosh Ghosh, General Manager as M.W. No. 1. He has stated that there are 6 Nos. of factories of M/s. Bata India Ltd. situated in India and more than 1200 shops/ stores throughout

India. There are about 1250 Nos. of Shop Managers, who manage and administer the shops/Shoe Stores of the company for and on behalf of the company throughout India. He has also stated that Managers are not the workmen and as such the present dispute raised by the Union cannot assume the character of an industrial dispute.

He has further stated that all the Shop Managers enjoy the authority to take decision in respect of the shops under his control including the control over the other workmen working in the shop. He has stated that Shop Managers are either appointed directly or promoted by virtue of an agreement describing thereunder their total responsibilities. As per the agreement the Shop Manager is to look after all the expenses incurred for maintaining the shop as he was to take decision relating to lightening, heating and cleaning the establishment, small repairs which are not of permanent nature, telephone, office necessities, supplies, postages, bank charges, maintenance of satisfactory quality and proper inventory of the stock, furniture, fixtures etc. The Shop Manager is required to look after the work of window trimmings, seasonal decorations and local advertisement and incur expenses for doing the same under the instructions of the company. It is the responsibility of the Shop Manager to look after the stock of shoes and other goods including furniture, fittings and customer's articles as well as the advertisement accessories. He is to look after the stock and dead stock and clear all the dead stocks under the instructions at the cost of the company. He is to take charge of the shop. He as a Manager is required to approve and forward bills for payment. The bills are sanctioned and paid only on his approval. That it is his duty to look after day to day management of the shop under his control, appoint temporary hands and make payment to them. He has further stated, it is the duty and function of a Shop Manager to recommend employees working under him for training for development needs of employees and recommend employees for promotion. It is the duty of Shop Manager to submit Annual Assessment (Performance Appraisal) of other employees working under him in the shop. He was authorised to select salesman to work as relieving hand manager to manage a shop in his absence, to approve travelling expenses of other shop employees, take disciplinary action against the shop employees, approve salary of the shop employees, determine number of staff in the stores to carry out business effectively, recommend a person for employment, authorise to make audit report, authorise to represent company in legal matters, control the expenses of the store, preserve and look after the stock of shoes and other furniture, fittings and responsible to make cash book and other necessary accounting statements and to place orders and to achieve 100% sales as fixed by the company and to develop the business of the company, allocate daily target to the salesman and resolve the customer's complaint.

The administrative duty of the Shop Manager is to control the attendance of the shop employees, allocate category of stock to the shop employees, recovery any loss from the staff on account of loss and damages, remit the sales proceed to the company, responsible to keep the shops open for development and promotion of business, keep the keys of the shop in his custody, responsible to maintain proper order and discipline in the shop and among the staff, to manage the inventory of the stores, responsible for safe custody of the sales proceeds and to see all the relevant files and papers are maintained properly, authorise to renew the registration of the Store under Shop and Establishment Act, responsible for safe custody of the goods and he is responsible for general control of the retail shop stores, repair and pedicure organisation and responsible for enforcing punctuality among the staff.

The Supervisory duties and functions of a Shop Manager is to carry instructions issued from time to time. He is to keep in touch with the Controlling Officer and seek advice, he is responsible to see proper arrangement of showcase, windows, racks etc. It is the duty of Shop Manager to supervise the works done by salesman, cashier and shop assistant and casual hands, address grievances of the other subordinate staff and to see the vouchers and entries are properly maintained.

During cross examination he has categorically stated that Shop Manager enjoys the authority to take decision in respect of a shop under him including the controlling workmen employed in the shop. Shop Manager is vested with independent authority to make seasonal decoration of their respective shop and empowered to approve the bills and forward the same for payment to the company. Shop Manager was given power to induct and impart training the employees of the shop, Shop Manager is vested with power to appoint temporary hand in the shop and sign the pay sheet of those temporary hands. That under the supervision of Shop Manager, payment of salary to the temporary hands is made by the company. Shop Managers are authorised to make audit of the account of the shop and appoint Advocate. It is the duty of the Shop Manager to make payment to the staff working under him and to see the correct payment is made. Shop Manager is responsible for making payment to outside suppliers supplying the necessary materials like wall papers, strings etc.

From the oral evidence which have come on record and discussed above it is seen the Shop Manager is the sole authority and in-charge of the shop and he is the one who has to take decision with regard how and in what manner the shop has to be run as per company's policy. He was given authority to appoint temporary hands and make payment to them and sign on the salary sheet of the other regular employees and as well that of those temporary hands engaged by him. He was given authority to incur incidental expenses and pay those expenses and also the salary of the employees working in the store from the sales proceeds. He had authority to place any employee working under him under suspension. He was the sole authority to appraise the performance of the employees working under him in the store and send their annual performance report to the company for the purpose of their promotion etc. He was to sign the daily mirror or daily sale statement of the shop. He was leave sanctioning authority of the employees working under him. It is also seen that under him Cashier, Salesman, Shop Assistant and Cobbler used to work. He was to take

decision in respect of any untoward incidents that take place in the store and to take immediate necessary step by informing or lodging police complaint and had also authority to engage a legal expert in connection of legal matters. It was the duty of Shop Manager to maintain stock and prepare list of dead stocks for disposal as per direction of the company.

However, let me discuss the documents that have been filed by the parties in support of their respective contentions. The termination letters which have been filed by the union and has been marked as Exhibit-W-5 shows that Mr. J. K. Ghosh (W.W. No. 1) was promoted as a Shop Manager of Bagbazar Shoe Store on 27-04-1970 and he signed on a fresh agreement dated 14-06-1999 and which sets out the terms and conditions under which he was to work as a Manager of the shop and also the conditions under which the management would be entitled to terminate his service.

Surprisingly, the union has failed to produce the agreement dated 14-06-1999 before the Tribunal, to show the nature of the duties to be discharged by a Shop Manager of Bata Shoe Store. However, W.W.No.2 during cross examination has admitted that job responsibility of Shop Managers of Bata Retail Shoe Stores throughout India is same. The job responsibility of a Manager described in writing by the management is correct. It is true such evidence of W.W No. 2 is vague regarding exactly which document he had referred to be correct. But it appears to the Tribunal, the witness is referring to those agreements which an employee is required to execute on his appointment as a Shop Manager or on promotion as a Shop Manager.

The termination letters of Sri Pitambar Ghosh, Manager, Bata Shoe Stores, Vivekananda Road dated 21-03-2007 and termination of Sri K.M. Putcha, Manager, Bata Shoe Stores, Hyderabad, Kharkana dated 28-02-2007 show that at the time of their promotion or appointment as Shop Managers of Bata Shoe Stores, an agreement was executed between the employer and the employees and such agreement contains terms and conditions under which the Store Manager, Bata Shoe Stores is to work and the conditions under which the management is entitled to terminate their services.

However, Exhibit-W-12, Exhibit-M-3 and M-14 appear to be the same document that is an agreement executed between Bata India Ltd. and one Sri Pitambar Ghosh on 10th September, 1999 on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Strand Road, Kolkata, Exhibit-M-28 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Sri D.K. Raha on 23-09-2006 on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at H.B. Road, Ranchi, Exhibit-M-53 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Mr. B.C. Palai dated 25th June, 2005 on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Bhubaneswar, A. Nagar, Exhibit-M-64 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Sri Trideab Changkakoti on 3rd November, on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Bhangabharh, Assam, Exhibit-M-76 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Sri K. M. Putcha on 23rd January, 2006, on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Secunderabad, Kharkana, Exhibit-M-84 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Sri K. S. V. Kumar on 30th June, 2004, on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Royapettah, Chennai and Exhibit-M-99 an agreement executed between M/s. Bata India Ltd. and Sri K. G. Ashok Kumar on 9th January, 2003, on the latter being appointed as a Manager of Retail Shoe Store situated at Vijaynagar, Bangalore show those agreements contain terms and conditions under which those Store Managers agreed to join as a Managers of Retail Shoe Store of Bata India Ltd.

Such agreements speak about the salary, annual increment and percentage of commission which a Store Manager is entitled to get on turnover of the store. Further, it contains job responsibility of a Store Manager.

Clause -3 of such agreement shows that Shop Manager was given the authority or power to make payment of recurring charges and expenses necessary for carrying on the business of sale of shoes and other goods as well as for repair work of footwear and for all pedicure treatments carry out in the store and which includes all expenses for lightening, heating, cleaning the establishment, small repairs not of a permanent nature, telephone, office necessities, supplies, postage, bank charges, maintenance of satisfactory quality and proper inventory of the stock, furniture, fixture etc. He was given authority to incur expenses for carriage of goods from railway or other stations or Ghats at destination of the place where the Shoe Store is situated and local travelling. He was authorised to make expenses from sales proceed for wrapping (papers and strings), for seasonal decorations and local advertisement. He is authorised to spend money for purchase of materials and payment of wages for the shoe repair and medicaments, laundry and all expenses for pedicure treatment.

He was further given power to pay salary of the staff approved by the company from the sale proceeds and he is required to maintain the special salary statement paid to the employees bearing the signature of the respective staff. It further provide that any expenses incurred by him not approved by the company or beyond the approval limit will be borne by him.

Clause-6 provides that Manager will be responsible for proper preservation and taking care of the stock of shoes and other goods including furniture, fittings and customer's articles as well as advertisement accessories.

Clause-7 further provides that it is the duty of the Shop Manager to inform the company from time to time regarding any local notice, rules or law in force in connection with the trade in the locality, or transport or any taxes,

or duty and also for performing or observing them correctly and properly according to the intents and purpose of the rules and laws, so far as they relate to the said Shoe Store.

As per clause-8 he was entrusted with the full responsibility for the safe custody and good condition of all stocks of shoes and other goods and their sales proceeds and other assets and properties of the company in the said shoe store entrusted to him or of which he is in charge and he will be liable to pay to the company the amount incurred for any damage and shortage and losses arising by any reason whatsoever in respect of any such stock or property and recover the same from him by the company if the loss is due to his negligence.

Clause-9 shows that Store Manager is entrusted to keep proper accounts and shall every week or fortnight deliver to the company full and correct accounts on the forms supplied by the company of all stocks, receipts, number of pairs sold and other details specified in the forms payments, transactions and dealing of all in relation to the business of the said Shoe Stores including the turnover or repair and pedicure. He will be responsible for such statement of accounts and if any error is detected he is required to rectify the same immediately. It is his duty to remit the sales proceeds to the company after deducting the expenses incurred or after keeping certain amount for meeting incidental expenses. That he is to fully cooperate with the District Manager and Retail Managers during the periodical inspection of the Store.

Clause -14 speaks that Shop Manager shall have the general control of the said Shop and Repair and Pedicure organisations but he is not authorised to pledge in any way the credit of the company.

Clause-15 of the agreement further provides, all the staff employed in the said Shoe Store and Repair and Pedicure Sections except Cobblers which the employee may engage from time to time as independent contractors in the attached Repair Shop, if any, will be the direct employees of the company. The service conditions of all the said Shoe Stores and Pedicure Organisation will be governed by the rules laid down and will be strictly followed by the Manager.

Clause 16, 17 and 18 provides that if there is any incident of theft, fire, burglary or damage to the Shoe Store it is the duty of the Shop Manager to inform the company about the incident and to cause enquiry into the incident and submit report or file an FIR before the police authority.

As per Clause-19 he is to personally arrange proper safety of the sale proceeds and other money belonging to the company that may be with him and he shall remain wholly liable and responsible to the company for any loss of the sale proceeds or other money.

As per Clause-20 he shall remit of the shop under him and which is in his custody and remit once a week/on every third working day/ every alternate working day to the company through the collection account of the State Bank of India in places where there are branches of the State Bank of India. In other places it should be sent in the form of a cross demand draft in favour of the company through one of the schedule bank or crossed Indian Postal Order or crossed drafts of the Reserve Bank of India, Calcutta. The liability of the Manager will be discharged by actual receipt of the money by the company.

From the above agreements, it is seen that Shop Manager has authority to appoint Cobblers from time to time to carry out repair works and who will be considered to be employee of the company. That he was given the power to incur incidental expenses towards of lightening, heating, cleaning the establishment, small repairs not of a permanent nature, telephone, office necessities, supplies, postage, bank charges, for maintenance of satisfactory quality and proper inventory of the stock, furniture, fixture, carriage of goods from railway or other stations or Ghats to the store, for wrapping (papers and strings), seasonal decorations and local advertisement. He was authorised to spend money for purchase of materials and payment of wages for the shoe repair and medicaments, laundry and all expenses for pedicure treatment from the sales proceeds of the store. He was also authorised to pay the approved salary to the staff of the store from the sales proceeds. That he was even given authority to cause an enquiry if there is any incident of fire, theft, burglary and to take necessary steps with the authorities concerned. He was also liable to pay the damages or loss suffered by the company due to his negligence and carelessness.

So, it is seen Shop Managers were the sole in charge of the retail shoe store. He was liable for any loss to the company due to his acts or negligence and omission. He was required to report properly to the company about any fire, theft, burglary, loot in the shop, to investigate into the matter and take necessary steps with the local authorities. He was given a power to incur incidental expenses for development of the business of the store from the sales proceeds. He was empowered to make temporary appointment, pay salary to the employees from the sales proceeds. From the above fact it is seen, Shop Managers was placed in charge of an independent store or outlet of Bata Shoe Stores and was given independent power in running the store for development of the store and he was the administrative head of the store.

That apart Exhibit-M-31, M-43, M-49, M-67, M-98 and M-109, the attendance registers maintained in different stores of Bata Retail Shoe Stores show that attendance register is maintained by the Shop Manager and he signed on the same and which show control over subordinate staff working under him.

Exhibit-M-19, M-30, M-32, M-44, M-57, M-90, M-97, M-114, M-119 and M-124 prima facie show that it is the duty of the Store Managers to sign on the daily mirror/ daily sales report of the shops and which shows his supervision on the work done by the salesmen.

Exhibit-M-4, M-15, M-29, M-41, M-65, M-79, M-92, M-103 and M-122 the attendance and pay sheets of temporary hands are signed by Shop Managers and he is the authority over the temporary hands engaged by him.

Exhibit- M-9, M-20, M-33, M-58, M-45, M-69, M-89, M-95, M-110, M-115, M-120, M-122 and M-125 prove that it is the manager of the store who has the sole authority to grant or not to grant any leave applied by the other employees of the store.

Exhibit-M-56, M-62, M-91, M-118 and M-123 salary data slip of the employees of the store including that of Manager is signed by the store managers and salary was paid under his supervision.

Exhibit- M-24, M-36, M-48, M-61, M-72, M-80, M-93, M-104, M-126 and M-126, the salary statement of shop is signed by the Manager of the shop and salary was paid under his supervision.

Exhibit-M-60, M-81, M-87, M-102, M-108, M-111 and M-116 cash accounting statement prove the Managers were fully responsible for the business and sales proceeds of the shop.

Exhibit-M-26, M-37, M-50 and M-73 prove that Shop Managers were only authorised to certify the authenticity of customer satisfaction with regard to the customers' claim settlement.

Exhibit-M-23, M-35, M-47, M-71, M-78, M-86 and M-106 stock accounting bears the signature of the Manager and which proves none but the Shop Manager is fully responsible regarding the entire stock of the store under his control.

Exhibit-M-1, M-27, M-52, M-39, M-63 and M-83 Annual Performance Report signed by shop managers and as well District Manager and it is the Store Manager was the performance evaluator of the staff working under him. That he used to recommend the subordinate staff of the store for training and promotion before the company.

Exhibit-M-126, M-132 and M-133 show that Manager enjoyed the authority to take decision in recruitment process of the shop employees on probation.

Exhibit-M-127 to 131 show that the Manager of Bata Shoe Stores has been authorised to discontinue the service of temporary staff in case of staff exceeding the prescribed number of employees by the company.

Exhibit-M-5 shows that Shop Manager has been authorised to take disciplinary action against its subordinate staff like a Cashier and place the staff under suspension.

Exhibit-M-10 shows Shop Manager was authorised to lodge police complaint in case there is any incident of fire in the store and damages of stock, cash, furniture etc.

All the above documents prima facie show that the Shop Manager is an independent authority to take decision in respect of the store to which he was sole in-charge. From the exhibited documents it is seen that Cobblers for repair, shop assistant for running the shop, salesman for promoting sales and cashier for receiving cash in a retail shop of Bata Shoe Stores used to work under him. Those documents leave no room for doubt that Shop Managers used to discharge supervisory cum administrative functions cum managerial functions in running the shop for the purpose of development of the business, for achievement of targeted sale and authority to maintain discipline in the store. Therefore, this Tribunal is unable to accept the argument advanced by Ld. Counsel for the Union, that those terminated employees were Managers only for the name sake and in reality they used to discharge the functions of a Shop Assistant, Cashier, Salesman. In fact the exhibited documents which have come on record show that those Shop Managers were sole independent in charge of the stores where they were posted as Managers and the decision making authority of the store on the matter to which they were given power as per the agreement executed between them and the company at the time of their appointment or promotion as a Shop Managers.

Ld. Counsel for the Union further submitted that duties and functions of the Shop Managers are stipulated in the Standing Orders and Rules of the Shop Managers, 1979 and there is no clause which stipulates and/or entrusted the Shop Managers to have any independent thinking and skilful application of mind to perform the duties. Shop Managers did not have any authoritative duty apart from their own duties to look after the proper placement of products in the shop, safe custody of sales proceed. Managers had to look after the complaints of the customers with regard to the products. Shop Manager had to disburse the salary of the employees like a cashier. He had to go to bank personally to deposit the sales proceeds every day like a Peon. He had to physically count the stock and record the quantum of stock in the printed form. Shop Manager had to discharge job of an Accountant for keeping the statement of income and expenditure. Manager had to do the manual job of opening and closing of the shop and keep the keys of the store as a security guard. Shop Manager had to count and verify the total supply of the products for sale. He had to perform the work of a salesman along with other salesman throughout the day and night. Shop Manager had no

independent power to dismiss or terminate the services of an employee of a store. That there is clause regarding strike and which prima facie prove that Shop Managers are workman.

It is true that there exists Standing Orders and Rules for Shop Manager, 1979. That standing orders contains conditions of service of an employee in the establishment. Therefore, this Tribunal is of view just because that there exists Standing Orders and Rules in respect of Shop Managers of Bata Shoe Stores will not make them a workman as contended by the Ld. Counsel for the union, when exhibited documents show when a person or an employee of Bata Shoe Stores is promoted as a Manager, a new agreement is executed between the Management and the Shop Manager and such agreement contains the duty and liabilities of the Shop Manager. The agreement Exhibit-W12, M-3, M-14, M-28, M-53, M-64, M-76, M-84 and M-99 already discussed above prima facie prove the Shop Manager was empowered to incur expenses towards maintenance of the shop relating to lightening, heating, cleaning of the establishment, small repairs not of a permanent nature, telephone, office necessities, supplies, postage, bank charges, maintenance of satisfactory quality and proper inventory of the stock, furniture, fixture etc. He was authorised to make expenses from sales proceed for wrapping (papers and strings), seasonal decorations and local advertisement. He was responsible for the proper observation, to look after the stock of shoes and other goods including furniture, fixture and customer's articles. He was to look after the stock and dead stock and clear the dead stock under the instructions and at the cost of the company. He was given authority to take independent decision in a particular matter. From the exhibited documents it is also seen under the supervision and control of the Shop Manager, Cashier, Salesman, Shop Assistant and Cobblers used to work. That he was authorised to recruit temporary employees and make payment to those employees from the sales proceeds. That he was the authority to grant or not to grant leave to the staff working in the store under him. That he was performance evaluator of the staff working under him in the store. That he used to recommend the staff for promotion and training. That he used to supervise and control the work done by the salesman, cashier and shop assistant including the cobblers, the temporary hands by signing on the daily shop mirror, attendance register, stock register, salary sheet and keeping the daily sales proceeds in his custody, verify the vouchers prepared by the cashier and also the key of the store in his custody. He was the leave sanctioning authority of his subordinates and had power to assign duties and distribute works. He had authority to indent materials, clear dead stocks and assess the performance of his subordinate employees.

Thus, it appears, shop manager was discharging the functions of a Manager and in-charge of the shop with the responsibility to open and close the store to conduct business of the retail store. He was the administrative head of the store as required to manage the overall functioning of the shop with the aid of his subordinates. Other employees working in the shop had no power or authority to do any work independently without the sanction and approval of the Manager. He used to supervise the work done by his subordinates. Being in-charge of one of the retail stores of Bata Shoes some time the Manager might had to do some clerical nature of job, such job cannot be said to be his main function.

That apart, the issue whether a Shop Manager of Bata Retail Store is workman or not has already been decided by the Hon'ble High Court, Gujarat in Bata India Ltd. & Ors. –vs- S. K. Chawla (supra) and such decision has been confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Appeal (Civil) No. 26424 of 2005 on 17-04-2006. Therefore, there remain nothing afresh to be decided by this Tribunal whether the Shop Manager of Retail Shoe Store of Bata India Ltd. is a workman or not.

In McLeod & Co. –vs- Sixth Industrial Tribunal, West Bengal it was held whether a person was a workman within the definition of Industrial Disputes Act would be the very foundation of the jurisdiction of the Industrial Tribunal. Since all those 236 terminated employees of Bata India Ltd. are found not to be workmen within the meaning of section 2(s) of I.D. Act, 1947, but persons holding independent charge of Manager of retail Shoe Shop and holding managerial and administrative post and as such this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to decide whether the termination of the 236 Shop Managers of M/s. Bata India Ltd. without holding any domestic enquiry is legal or illegal. However, it has come on record those 236 Shop Managers were terminated from the service by the management of M/s. Bata India Ltd. without adhering to the principle of natural justice i.e. without serving any show cause notice, without any charge sheet and without holding any domestic enquiry.

In view of the above the Reference is not maintainable in this Industrial Tribunal as there exists no industrial dispute between the management of M/s. Bata India Ltd. and its 236 Retail Shoe Store Managers. Accordingly, Reference No. NT-2 of 2007 is disposed of.

Justice K. D. BHUTIA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 774.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक के प्रबंधन, संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, **चंडीगढ़-II** के पंचाट (13/2017) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01-2024-आईआर(बी-II)-01]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th April, 2024

S.O. 774.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 13/2017) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Indian Overseas Bank and their workmen.

[No. L-39025/01-2024-IR(B-II)-01]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

**IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
CHANDIGARH.**

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer.

ID No. 13/2017

Registered on:-05.03.2018

Sh. Hemant Singh S/o Sh. Kalyan Singh, R/o Village Meerapur, PO Baghola, Tehsil and District Palwal.

.....Workman

Versus

1. Indian Overseas Bank, SCF No. 114-115, HUDA Market, Sector 28, Faridabad through its Chief Manager.
2. The Chief Manager, Indian Overseas Bank, SCF No. 114-115, HUDA Market, Sector 28, Faridabad.

.....Respondents/Managements

AWARD

Passed On:-12.01.2024

1. The workman Hemant Singh has filed the present claim petition under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the averment that he had been employed by the respondent no.1 on the post of Record Keeper w.e.f. 14.03.2014. The workman had worked with the management of respondent no.2 till 05.09.2017 when his services had been illegally terminated by the management of Indian Overseas Bank. The services of the workman had been terminated by the management wrongfully, illegally, malafidely, arbitrarily and unjustly on 06.09.2017. On 02.08.2017 the workman met with an accident on the way he was coming for duty. The workman had suffered multiple injuries on his face and was remained on medical leave upto 04.09.2017. The workman came on duty after medical fitness on 05.09.2017. On 06.09.2017 the respondent-bank had stopped the entry of the workman into the premises of the respondent-bank and terminated the services of the workman w.e.f. 06.09.2017. The workman had been drawing a salary of Rs.5,700/- per month at the time of his illegal termination from service. The workman falls within the definition of workman under Section 2(S) of the ID Act. Therefore, the termination of the services of the workman is a clear case of retrenchment as per the Industrial Disputes Act and further the management did not comply with the mandatory provision of ID Act, which sets the condition precedent to be fulfilled prior to retrenchment of workman. The respondent-bank neither complied with the aforesaid mandatory provisions nor paid the retrenchment compensation or notice pay in lieu of the same. The workman is unemployed since the date of his illegal termination. The principles of natural justice have been violated in the present case. After the termination of the services of the workman, the respondent-bank had appointed one other person namely Munish against the post held by the workman. The post against which the workman had been employed is perennial in nature and still exists. The workman had completed more than 240 days of service during the preceding 12 months of the date of his illegal termination. In view of the submissions made above, it is therefore prayed that the workman may kindly be reinstated in service with continuity of service along with back wages and other consequential benefits.

2. The respondent-management has filed its written statement, alleging therein that the workman was never appointed by the respondent-bank on any post. The services of the workman were used as casual labour as and when need arose and he was paid for the same on daily basis. As the workman had never been recruited on bank rolls, the question of termination of his services does not arise in any manner. The workman is not a workman under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as there was no employer and employee relationship between the workman and respondent-bank. In respect of permanent employees, who are on the roll of the bank draw salary and allowances once in a month, which is credited to their salary accounts. However, in this case, the workman was engaged as a casual labour and paid on daily basis through vouchers. No such termination as alleged was issued to the workman since he was not on the rolls of the bank. It is denied that the service of the workman has been illegally terminated without following the principle of natural justice. No recruitment/appointment has been made for the said post since long in

the respondent-bank. No such post lying vacant/exists with the respondent-bank. The workman has not completed 240 days in any manner continuously. In view of the above, it is respectfully prayed that the claim statement filed by the workman may kindly be dismissed with costs.

3. The workman filed replication to the written statement filed by the management. The facts alleged in the replication are same as alleged in the claim petition hence, need not to be repeated again.

4. Parties were given opportunity to lead evidence.

5. In support of his case, the workman has filed its affidavit in evidence but was not cross-examined by the management as the management was proceeded ex parte on 07.01.2020.

6. I have heard Sh. Raj Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for the workman in the absence of management and perused the file and record carefully.

7. Undisputedly, to claim the benefit and protection under Section 25-F of the Act, a workman has to establish on the record that he had completed the continuous service of 240 days under his employer in the preceding 12 calendar months from the date of termination of his services as envisaged under Section 25-B of the Act meaning thereby that in the present case, the workman has to establish that he had completed the continuous service of 240 days with the respondent-management in the last calendar year.

8. In his affidavit Ex.WW1/A the claimant/workman has stated that he had been employed by the respondent-bank on the post of Record Keeper w.e.f. 14.03.2014 and he had joined as such he worked there from 4.3.2014 to 6.9.2017 and his services were terminated wrongfully and illegally w.e.f. 6.9.2017. He had been drawing Rs.5700/- per month on the date of illegal termination of his services. He is workman within the definition of Section 2(S) of the Act. He was paid through voucher for the entire period of service rendered with the respondent-bank. He has placed on record copy of payment voucher Ex.W-4 to W-369. The evidence and documents brought on record has proved that the workman was appointed by the respondent-bank. In the face of documents Ex.W1 to Ex.W367 as discussed above, it stands proved on record that the workman/claimant has been working under the management-bank from 14.03.2014 to till 06.09.2017 when his services were terminated. The evidence brought on record by the workman has gone un rebutted and unchallenged and there is reason why the same should not be believed.

9. It is clear from the perusal of the aforesaid observations that even if a person is engaged on temporary, part time or contract basis or for doing any other kind of work and is duly paid wages for the said work, in that eventuality such a person would be covered by the definition of “workman” as provided in Section 2(S) of the Act.

10. The version of the claimant/workman that his services were illegally terminated by the management w.e.f. 06.09.2017 without any notice or compensation pay has gone unchallenged and urebutted inasmuch as the management has neither pleaded nor led any evidence contrary thereto. Since the management has neither issued any notice, nor has paid any compensation in lieu of notice period to the workman/claimant prior to termination of his services w.e.f. 18.06.2015, this amounts to violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act.

11. The respondent-bank has taken a plea in his written statement that the workman was never appointed by the respondent-bank on any post. The services of the workman were used as casual labour as and when need arose for and he was paid for the same on daily basis. As the workman had never been recruited on bank rolls, the question of termination of his services does not arise in any manner. The workman was engaged as a casual labour and paid on daily basis through vouchers. No recruitment/appointment has been made for the said post since long in the respondent-bank. No such post lying vacant/exists with the respondent-bank. The workman has not completed 240 days in any manner continuously. It is settled law that pleadings cannot take place of proof. Mere pleading in a written statement is not sufficient and to prove the said plea, the management was required to lead cogent and consistent evidence. Here in this case, the management proceeded against ex parte and failed to lead any ioto of oral or documentary evidence to prove the said plea. The conduct of the management in not leading evidence and further giving vague pleas in the written statement, needs to be depreciated with strongest possible words. The management even did not dispute the crucial factum of the workman having completed his continuous service of more than 240 days. Therefore, the management cannot get away from the findings that the services of the workman were illegally and wrongfully terminated without following due procedure or law under Section 25-F of the Act.

12. Since there is no submission by the respondent-bank who was proceeded against ex-parte hence, while believing the statement of workman, the Court comes to the conclusion that termination of services of workman is illegal and invalid. The respondent-bank has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act.

13. Now having held so in the preceding paragraphs that the workman has been victimized by the management, the next important question though very short, which arises for the consideration of this Court is that what relief the workman is entitled to?

14. Learned counsel for workman has argued that respondent-bank has violated the provision of Section 25-F of the Act without offering retrenchment compensation as provided under Section 25-F will make termination as illegal and in support relied upon the judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of “Anoop Sharma Vs. Executive Engineer, Public Health, Division No.1, Panipat reported in 2010(3) SCT 318 holding that “provisions of Section

25-F are mandatory and non-compliance thereof rendered the retrenchment of an employee as nullity.” Similar view were taken by the Hon’ble High Court in 2010(1) Law Herald (SC) 592 in the case of Ramesh Kumar Vs. State of Haryana, in which it is held that “workman worked for 3 years and termination of his services in violation of compliance of provisions of Section 25-F so workman was held entitled to claim relief.” In a judgment of Haryana Agricultural University Vs. Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court and another 2011 LLR 1218, wherein it has been held that “termination of service of an employee who has completed 240 days continuous service, without payment of retrenchment compensation simultaneously at the time of termination by complying with the provisions of Section 25-F, may attract reinstatement that too with full back wages, continuity of service and consequential benefits.” I find force in the arguments of workman.

15. In the light of foregoing discussions, it is held that the workman has been able to lead any cogent and sufficient evidence on the file to prove that he had completed the continuous service of 240 days with the respondent-bank as its employee during the preceding 12 calendar months from the date of alleged termination of his services and that his services were allegedly terminated by the respondent-bank and that the alleged termination of his services is illegal and invalid.

16. In view of my findings on the above discussed issues, as discussed in the preceding paragraphs, this reference is decided in favour of the workman to the effect that he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service along with 30% back wages from the date of his illegal termination.

17. Let copy of this award be sent to Central Government for publication as required u/S 17 of ID Act, 1947.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 775.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एस बी आई के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चंडीगढ़-II के पंचाट (50/2021) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01-2024-आईआर(बी-I)-150]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th April, 2024

S.O. 775.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 50/2021) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh-II* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of SBI and their workmen.

[No. L-39025/01-2024-IR(B-I)-150]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, CHANDIGARH.

Present: Sh. Kamal Kant, Presiding Officer.

ID No. 50/2021

Registered on:-07.01.2019

Sh. Dharamjeet S/o Sh. Barkha Ram, R/o Village Boh, District Ambala, Haryana.

.....Workman

Versus

1. Deputy General Manager, SBI, Sector 5, Panchkula.

2. A.G.M.(RM), RBO-1, SBI, Sector-5, Panchkula.

.....Respondents/Managements

AWARD

Passed On:-11.12.2023

1. The workman Dharamjeet has filed the present claim petition on 26.10.2018 under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 for alteration/change of service condition of workman during the course/pendency of proceedings before this Tribunal.

2. During the pendency of the proceedings before this Tribunal, learned AR of the workman Sh. O.P. Indal has made a statement that he does not want to press his application dated 26.10.2018 and withdrawn the same and it may be dismissed as withdrawn, which is recorded separately.

3. In view of the statement made by the learned AR of the workman, the present reference deserves to be dismissed as withdrawn. Accordingly, the instant reference filed under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 stands dismissed as withdrawn. File after completion be consigned in the record room.

4. Let copy of this award be sent to the Appropriate Government as required under Section 17 of the Act for publication.

KAMAL KANT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 776.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन, संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय हैदराबाद के पंचाट (34/2018) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-12025/01-2024-आईआर(बी-1)-151]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th April, 2024

S.O. 776.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 34/2018) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Hyderabad* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen.

[No. L-12025/01-2024-IR(B-I)-151]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present: - **Sri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

Dated the 18th day of January, 2024

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE LC No. 34/2018

Between:

Sri Janagama Raju,

S/o Late Odelu,

R/o H.No. 21-6-121/11/1

Pragathi Nagar, Food Corporation of India,

NTPC of Ramagundam (M),

Peddapalli Dist.

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Manager,
State Bank of India Vittal Nagar,
Godavarikhani Branch (Erstwhile State Bank of Hyderabad)
Peddapalli District –Code No. 20956.
2. The Zonal Manager,
State Bank of India (Erstwhile State Bank of Hyderabad)
JPN Road, Warangal.
3. The Regional Manager,
State Bank of India (Erstwhile State Bank of Hyderabad)
Godavarikhani.
4. The Chief General Manager,
State Bank of India (Erstwhile State Bank of Hyderabad)

Administrative Local Head Office, Koti,

Hyderabad.

... Respondents

Appearances:

For the Petitioner : Sri S. Bhagawanth Rao, Advocate

For the Respondent : Sri Y. Ranjeeth Reddy, Advocate

AWARD

Sri Janagama Raju who worked as Scavenger cum Peon (who will be referred to as the workman) has filed this petition under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 against the Respondents State Bank of India (erstwhile State Bank of Hyderabad) seeking for reinstatement into service duly granting all the consequential benefits such as continuity of service, back wages and all other attendant benefits etc., and such other reliefs as this court may deem fit.

2. Respondent filed counter. Case is posted for Petitioner's evidence.

3. During the pendency of the proceeding, Counsel for Petitioner has filed memo submitting that Petitioner was provided with employment and requested to close the ID as withdrawn. Memo served on Respondent who reported/endorsed no objection. Hence, requested to close the ID as withdrawn. In view of the above, I dispose of the dispute in terms of the prayer as made in the memo filed by the Petitioner dated 18.1.2024. Hence, the case is disposed of accordingly.

Award is passed accordingly. Transmit.

Typed to my dictation by Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant and corrected by me on this the 18th day of January, 2024.

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the

Witnesses examined for the

Petitioner

Respondent

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 24 अप्रैल, 2024

का.आ. 777.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार केनरा बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र, संबद्ध नियोजको और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय बेंगलूर के पंचाट (47/2018) प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-39025/01-2024-आईआर(बी- II)-11]

सलोनी, उप निदेशक

New Delhi, the 24th April, 2024

S.O. 777.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 47/2018) of the *Cent.Govt.Indus.Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Bangalore* as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Canara Bank and their workmen.

[No. L-39025/01-2024-IR(B-II)-11]

SALONI, Dy. Director

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
BENGALURU CAMP At HYDERABAD

DATED : 19th FEBRUARY 2024

PRESENT : **Shri IRFAN QAMAR**

Presiding Officer

ID No. 47/2018

APPLICANT

Sh. B Hanumantappa,
S/o Nanjundappa,
25, 6th Cross, 1st Main,
Nandini Layout,
BANGALORE – 560 096.

RESPONDENTS

1. Kashi Security and Consultancy Services Private Limited, No. 332, 13th Main, 6th Cross, HAL II Stage, Indiranagar, BANGALORE – 560 038.
2. The General Manager, Canara Bank, Head Office, J C Road, BANGALORE.

Appearances

I Party : **Sh. R Nagendra Naik**

Advocate

II Party : 1. **Sh. G L Vishwanath**

Advocate

2. **Sh. T R K Prasad**

Advocate

1. The petition is filed under Sec 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 (for brevity 'the Act') by the 1st Party workman / former employee of the Kashi Security and Consultancy Services Private Limited/Canara Bank who is Discharged from service w.e.f. 31.03.2017 by both the Respondents.

2. After Registering the matter notices were issued to parties who appeared. During the pendency of Industrial Dispute parties filed Memo of Withdrawal alongwith Affidavit stating that an out of Court settlement has been arrived with the Respondent No. 1 and they do not have any further claim against both the Respondents. Therefore, prayed to pass consent award in the interest of justice.

3. Perused the records, Applicant has filed Memo for Withdrawal dated 25.01.2024 in the present matter voluntarily. The Respondents have submitted no Objection in that regard. Therefore, in view of the above Memo for Withdrawal is allowed and the Petition filed by the Petitioner under Section 2A(2) of ID Act is dismissed as withdrawn in terms of the settlement arrived out of the Court accordingly. No Claim Award is passed. Transmit.

(Dictated to Secretary to Court at Camp Court, transcribed by him, corrected and signed by me on 19th February 2024)

IRFAN QAMAR, Presiding Officer